

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1888.

I.

CRITICISM ON THE MODERN PULPIT.

BY REV. JAMES A. MCCAULEY, D.D., LL.D.,
President of Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

To avoid misconception in regard to what may follow, we are anxious, in the outset, to avow the highest appreciation of criticism, as also to disclaim any wish to exempt the pulpit therefrom. Nothing will be said in disparagement of criticism; rather, we are anxious to concede that its function is most noble. There can be no question of its eminent place among the agencies by which, in this imperfect world, things are properly distinguished; by which shams are brought to light and put to grief; by which, in all the various fields of activity—in literature and art; in professional and ordinary life, the spurious and hurtful are stripped of disguises, the genuine and deserving cleared of suspicion, and, if slowly, yet certainly adjusted to their final place in the recognition and approval of mankind. It is, indeed, the winnowing-fan which drives away the chaff, and leaves the golden grain; the crucible in which the crude ores of human thought and human work are so melted down, that whatever in them is worthy to live may free itself

from that which deserves to perish. Nor have we, as intimated, any wish to ask for the pulpit immunity from criticism. There is, indeed, a sense in which it is exempt. The great truths which it is appointed to teach, the ends at which it must supremely aim, the power on which it must, at last, rely for their accomplishment,—in their nature, these are matters over which human judgment has no jurisdiction. In all, however, that pertains to the human side of preaching, the measure in which it inculcates the truth divinely given it to voice, the fidelity with which it follows its supreme purpose, the tenacity with which it cleaves to the power on which its effectiveness depends, the awkwardness or skill with which it handles the treasures of the kingdom,—in these and other respects the pulpit is just as liable to answer at the bar of criticism as any other agency that men employ. And it is quite as much the part of wisdom in the pulpit to profit by timely and judicious animadversion, as it is the part of duty to rebuke the temerity which dares to sit in judgment on those divine facts with which it has no liberty to meddle.

As regards the pulpit, then, criticism may be at fault in two ways: It may assume to judge where it has no jurisdiction, or may judge unfairly where it has. In the former case, it is simply impertinent; in the latter, it may justly claim that those who think its strictures injudicious, shall, on grounds of reason, make them so appear.

No one familiar with prevalent opinion touching the matter now in hand will think it exaggeration to say that there is a widespread faulting of the modern pulpit. From the platform and the press there is much accusing of it for short-comings of almost every kind. Censure flows from tongue and pen; the air is heavy with carping and complaint; and, though it is less the fashion now than formerly to assail religion and its institutions openly, there are not wanting those who flippantly pronounce preaching the institute of an antiquated superstition, which the race, having advanced to that manhood in which childish things are put away, refuses longer to revere; that it

is effete and spent; that culture is the true, divine ministry gifted to interpret the wants of modern society, and to supply its needs, with a perfection which the pulpit fails immensely to approach.

Now, whatever there may be in these views to lament, there is nothing certainly to fear. The pulpit is too firmly set to be shaken by such blasts. That yearning of our nature which nothing but the gospel is able to appease, that superiority of Christian nations so demonstrably the fruit of those eternal truths which it is the special office of the pulpit to proclaim, not merely refute these charges and pretensions, but vindicate its claim to pre-eminence among the agencies of good. Reposing on so stable a foundation—the witness of history to its elevating power, and the witness of our own nature to the insufficiency of all besides the truth it teaches to satisfy our infinite desires—the pulpit will not be overthrown by the wildest shock of infidel assault.

But there is a faulting of the pulpit not to be so quickly put aside. Unreasonable, no doubt, much of it is; yet, as being the offspring of professed and, to some extent, of sincere concern to invest preaching with increased attractiveness and power, it deserves to be considered.

What, then, are the allegations made against the modern pulpit? None, perhaps, is oftener made than its lack of independence. On every hand this charge is coming out in insinuation or assertion. The pulpit, say its critics, is truckling and obsequious; is unduly sensitive to popular opinion; has lost the olden courage to give out in bold assertion the great truths which alone are mighty to rouse, and kindle and control.

A famous lecturer, some time since, was at special pains to institute a comparison of the pulpit, the press and the platform in respect to their fidelity in advocating the truth. In that easy, *ex cathedra* style so familiar to the platform, he put the case, in substance, thus: That the press is so servile to its party, or, if neutral, is so considerate of its purse, and the

pulpit is so regardful of the pew, that unpopular truth is little likely to receive from either of them impartial exhibition or defense; that editors and preachers are under pressure not to say what would hurt their occupation, or even, it might happen, take away their bread; that, however truth may suffer at their hands, it must be trimmed and toned to suit the liking of those for whom it is prepared; that, compared with these, the platform occupies a vantage ground of independence, that, having nothing to ask nor anything to fear, it can be entirely honest in the utterance of conviction.

Were the subject less grave, we could afford to smile at the conceit which could talk thus to people of sense. It is, indeed, to be confessed that truth is liable to suffer from the pressure of popular opinion on those who undertake to give it voice; but certainly it is not obvious to the ordinary mind how the platform happens to be less affected by this pressure than the pulpit or the press. Lecturers are, indeed, somewhat noted for liberal views of compensation. As a rule, the worthiest cause must fee them well, or do without their service. Many a preacher toils a year for less than they demand for the service of a week. In their case, no less than in the case of preachers and writers for the press, compensation follows popularity; and, as with them, compensation involves a direct tax, they of all expounders of truth must have a care to conciliate and please. Preachers and editors can better afford than they to be fearless and outspoken in the inculcation and defense of unpalatable truths. Men who ask, and by pleasing, contrive to get, a hundred dollars for an hour's talk, and then set up to be the untrammelled advocates of truth, must, to say the least, be deeply stricken with professional conceit.

But this charge of timidity and truckling, as against the pulpit, is not always thus boldly put, nor is it left to rest on mere arbitrary affirmation. Some of the most trenchant pens in modern literature have, in notable instances, employed their skill to render this charge plausible. The *Bondage of the Pulpit* was, a few years since, the subject of two elaborate

papers in one of the leading Monthlies of the country. Their object was to make it clear that the modern pulpit fails in courageous utterance, deals too little in rebuke, is deficient in that quality of modern daring which has marked the pulpit in all the golden eras of its power. Whoever wishes may see a reply in the same Monthly (Scribner's) no less trenchant than the charge. I propose to treat it in another way.

It is not well to hide from ourselves the fact—for such it surely is—that there are in modern times peculiar solicitations to pulpit dereliction, as regards a fearless proclamation of the truth. It is to be confessed that the refinement now so commonly diffused and the elegance and luxury to which our social life has come, do, in a real sense, test the courage of the preacher. He can but feel that the doctrines of the cross, faithfully proclaimed, are apt to be unwelcome; that, to declare the nothingness in God's sight of all merely human advantages; that, to show the moral and refined that, without the grace of Christ, they will be undone, is to risk offense. Nor may it be concealed that dereliction here is fatal to effective preaching. If the preacher handle truth deceitfully, keeping back a part or smothering its force in softly-sounding platitudes, he takes away its power, not perhaps to please, but certainly to stir the conscience and convert the soul. But has the pulpit failed under this testing? Has it been untrue to its divine commission? Is the preaching of the present, to any wide extent, a deceitful handling, a partial presentation, or mere human dilution, of the word of God? The peculiar influences of modern times may, indeed, have inspired the pulpit with carefulness to avoid offense, and to awaken hearers to a pleased attention and receptive disposition; but the instances are rare and exceptional in which this is done at sacrifice of faithfulness. And has not this carefulness the highest of all sanctions—the example of Christ Himself? Indeed, the criticism of the papers referred to has, I think, its overwhelming answer in the fact that it quite as much arraigns the ministry of Christ as that of His ambassadors to-day. It exaggerates greatly beyond the

practice of Christ one undoubted duty of the pulpit, that, namely, of rebuke. As a piece of art, it violates the logical caution, *ne nimis*; is a clear case of *too much*. From asserted short-coming in one particular, it predicates of the pulpit general delinquency—*falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*. But is the premise true? Let it even be that the pulpit of to-day is considerate, sparing of rebuke; that it does not flash and thunder, is not girt with lightnings, nor swift to scatter bolts, does this fact necessarily, or even fairly, infer cowardice—bondage to the influences with which modern life environs it? May not this considerateness have a worthy inspiration? Is it not wise? Does it not accord with the spirit of the Gospel and the example of Christ? Of preaching, as of other kinds of speaking, the proper object is persuasion. Preachers, therefore, must, to the furthest limit of divine allowance, regard the necessity of conciliating, in Aristotle's word, the *euvota*, *good will*, of those they would persuade to acceptance of the truth. Moreover, from the spirit of the Gospel, as from the one divinely-perfect model of preaching, it seems impossible to think that, in the ordinary ministrations of the pulpit, conciliation is less imperative than denunciation and rebuke, when occasion calls for these. Not so much, then, to parry this assault as to ascertain in the light of Christ's example the proper place of conciliation in preaching, I would fix attention for a moment on the ministry of Christ.

Passing, with but bare allusion, His attractive way of putting truth, His matchless use of incident and illustration, of comparison, simile and parable, it is obvious to note how patient was His dealing with existing prejudice, how skillful His advance upon the outworks of error, and how complete, for this, was their frequent demolition. Never was there a teacher who had more to overcome. There was universal misconception of His character and work. There was national conceit so excessively intense as to scorn the mere suggestion that others were to share the blessings of His reign. In a word, preconceptions of immemorial growth bitterly antagonized all that was most

vital in His message. To plant truth in a soil thus preoccupied and overgrown, was the hard task that lay before Him. In its prosecution there is a patient tenderness of manner that forces admiration. He does not openly assail these cherished misconceptions. His discourses are not bitter with upbraidings of this arrogant conceit. Knowing that the surest way to vanquish error is to confront it with the truth, He patiently employs all His mastery of illustration to imbue the popular mind with correct ideas of His kingdom. It must not, however, be inferred that this lenient way of treating prejudice, this gentle skill in planting truth, was at any cost of principle. With Him fidelity sacrificed nothing to conciliation. Times came in His ministry, as they likely will in that of all, when nothing was in place but stern rebuke and bold attack. Fain as Jesus was to conciliate, tenderly as He ever treated those whose erroneous views were rather their misfortune than their fault, when He came to deal with those who knowingly perverted truth, whose zeal for righteousness was but a cloak for sin, He was stern, severe, denunciatory—tore the veil from hypocrisy—laid bare disguised iniquities—in tones, as of the elder prophets, uttered woes and doom.

The criticism on which we animadvert is faulty then, not in that it makes rebuke a duty of the pulpit, but in that it makes it so in excessive measure, and then because the pulpit does not measure up in this respect to its unauthorized requirement, charges it with servility and cowardice. Rather should we take for guidance that union of tenderness and severity divinely instanced in the Master; that union of sympathizing tenderness, with care to shun offense, save when truth forbids, and then dealing in rebuke sharply but in love. Fail not to keep in mind that the exacting spirit, which concedes nothing to people's prepossessions; which believes that till it has forced the door, truth will not be able to get in; that the disputatious temper, which takes no counsel of prudence, but, rushing in direct assault against the walls of prejudice, spends its force in hurling bolts, fail not to keep in mind that such temper and

spirit not merely ignore the example of Christ, they war against the plainest principle of human nature. Men are easy to lead, but impossible to drive. Forget not, though, that honesty must be an equal care; that the man who temporizes in the sacred office, who, under any stress of favor or fear, allows the suggestion of possible consequences to modify the message, when truth is at stake, is equally astray from the example of Christ. To set forth the great truths of salvation clearly, impressively, practically, with judicious regard to them that hear, and with beseeching tenderness, trusting all to God, *that*, whether it come in softest flow from sons of consolation, or in loudest peal from sons of thunder, that is to preach as Jesus did.

Another charge against the pulpit of to-day, which is having manifold expression, is a want of liberality; it is too much confined, the critics say, within a narrow circle of doctrines. It is out of reason, they maintain, that a few theological dogmas, familiar from incessant repetition, and for the most part treated with a sameness fatal to the interest they might otherwise inspire, can satisfy an age so much alive as this to questions which take hold of its intellect and heart, and whose treatment by the press, and on the platform, is so hearty, fresh and stirring. Give the pulpit wider scope; allow it freer dealing with the great social and scientific questions which engross the age; let it wake itself from dull and soporific disquisition on its little round of threadbare themes, to the freedom and variety of natural discourse on topics in which people have a present living interest. Such, in the views of these critics, are the cause and the cure of the loudly-bruited ineffectiveness of modern preaching.

There is a show of plausibility in this complaint; and, as it is so attuned to the spirit of the age, no other, it is likely, awakens wider sympathy. Now whatever concession must be made to this view, it were certainly of easy proof that it overstates the evil and proposes a delusive remedy. Of dullness in the pulpit—mere perfunctory preaching—there is, it may be,

far too much; yet assuredly the charge of illiberality cannot, in fairness, be preferred against it. It is not a narrow circle of truth with which the pulpit deals. Its themes, in themselves, and in their manifold relations to individual and social life, furnish scope and matter for instruction and persuasion, for argument and eloquence, surpassing all that other themes afford. Nor is it true that their inherent attractiveness has undergone decay. The truth, with which the pulpit has to do, touches human life on every side, and at every stage. Its interest for man is grounded in his nature, his relations, his destiny, and is just as indestructible as these. Indifferent to the claims of spiritual truth as people may become; much as there may be in the whirl and din of modern life to dull the force of its appeals; inimical to its effect, as may be the fastidiousness engendered by the culture or pretension of the age, yet people never grow so callous, nor are so much engrossed, as to free themselves entirely from its hold upon them. An advocate within unceasingly asserts its claim, sometimes in tones which startle from the slumber of indifference, and drown the brawling of the world, and stir the soul to feel that its interest in these is supreme and eternal. In spite of all that hinders their impression, the doctrines of the gospel, expounded aright, and faithfully enforced, and quickened by the Spirit, have a power, unshared by other truth, to stir the fountains of emotion, and sway the intellect and heart. If feebleness has come to modern preaching, it is not because the truth it deals with is narrow in its range, or wanting in its interest for men. It is, in fact, untrammelled—may enter any field, take tribute of all truth. Nature and life, science and art, literature in all its forms, may be drawn upon for help in its one great task of setting forth, and pressing home, the truth given of God to save. Only, however, as ministrant to this one supreme purpose can it have to do with these. Questions of mere philosophic or scientific interest, or those which chiefly affect man as a resident of this world, may not, except in rarest instances, be made the matter of preaching. The pulpit has its own

divinely-given themes—themes grander in their meaning than all philosophy has taught; wider in their range than ever science swept; firmer in their hold upon the human heart than all besides in which it has concern.

Another way in which sometimes the pulpit is unfairly dealt with deserves the notice of a word. Both in the talk and in the writings of the times, it is no infrequent practice to fix attention on excesses sometimes appearing in the pulpit, and then to treat these in a way to create the impression that they are representative. On the principle by which, as Virgil says the Trojans judged the Greeks—*ab uno disce omnes*—the faults of individual preachers are so conceived and put as, in effect, to scandalize the body. Flippant talk, or smart writing, on eccentricities sometimes exhibited, expose the pulpit to the wrong and harm of indiscriminate derision.

Any wish to exempt the pulpit from legitimate criticism was, in the outset, disclaimed. It is conceded now, that if, in any case, it becomes fairly amenable to satire, by no means shall that be spared. No more is insisted on than that it be discriminate. The function of satire is no more to be denied than that of other forms of criticism, nor is its service any more disputable. "But satire has its laws; and in these it certainly is included that it must never be absolutely in error, and that it must never be absolutely frivolous. There is a mirth which comports with earnestness and reverence; but there is such a thing as the laughter of paralysis, and what more ghastly than that? Laughter is noble and profitable; but not that of the madman, when he sets the house on fire, or that of the fool, who goes to wedding or funeral with the same mindless grin. The office of satire is to prune the excrescences that will adhere to the best of human things. But it becomes at once of malign influence, if its attacks menace the truth itself, if, in cutting away the excess of foliage, it draws the vital sap from the tree; if, in curing the squint, it cuts out the eye."*

As regards the pulpit, when satire fails to discriminate the

* Peter Bayne. Christian Life.

faulty from the good, levels its shafts against buffooneries and follies sometimes attaching to it, with no intimation that the practices it pillories are incidental and exceptional, but with the implication rather that they are inherent and normal, it ceases to be legitimate, degenerates into mere ridicule, sinks from the lofty aim of correcting abuses to the low work of traducing the pulpit itself. Of no treatment it receives has the pulpit juster reason to complain, than of that which singles out incidental improprieties, and, under pretense of satirizing these, holds up to obloquy not these only, but, in effect, that too which they disgrace. But is it ever treated thus? No one, I think, familiar with the talk in certain circles, or conversant with certain types of current literature, can feel at liberty, in the largest exercise of charity, to say that treatment of the pulpit, such as I have hinted, is imaginary. Because here and there a pulpit lends itself to practices which are justly open to censure, it is insinuated, sometimes flippantly asserted, that the pulpit as an institution is inclined to fanaticism; that preachers, as a class, are not unwilling to prostitute the throne of their power to such procedures as will gain them popularity. In books which multitudes have read, perchance laughed over, there are elaborate pictures of men in the sacred office so drawn as to be meant for types, which, yet, have nothing like them in the ordinary pulpit; such, for instance, as Bedlow, of Arthur Bonnycastle, by whose manipulations that youth, and so many more, were deluded to believe themselves converted; or Grimshaw, the odious impersonation of illiberality, who stubbornly refused to fellowship with any, no matter how good, whose belief did not perfectly square with his creed, or, from the same hand, later, the picture of the placid Dr. Snow, of Sevenoaks, who solemnly twaddles nonsense, while Belcher carries on his knavery, and Jim Fenton preaches like one inspired. It is impossible not to see in these daubs mere caricatures of the pulpit. We have no word to say of their motive; but the practical effect of such delineations, set as they always are, in bold contrast with the better preaching of men mostly unconverted, cannot otherwise

than be to expose the pulpit to undeserved obloquy. When Charles Dickens pictured Mrs. Jellyby managing committees, and, in many ridiculous ways exerting herself with unremitting fussiness to convert people in the "uttermost parts of the earth," her own domestic duties being, meanwhile, utterly ignored, her family left to all the miseries of an unkept home, there was vast titter throughout the English reading world at the smartness of the great limner. None the less, however, for the smartness and the laugh, the picture is a hideous deformity. Satire is malignant when that which excites laughter is a mere distortion. Mrs. Jellyby is no real type—is a gross caricature of the tens of thousands throughout the Christian world, who, emulous of Him who went about doing good and neglectful of no duty to home or neighborhood, are devoting time and means and talent to the bettering of the world. That Christian philanthropy which recognizing the brotherhood of man, thrills with aspiration to bless the farthest off, as well as the nearest by, which, impersonating, as in Isaac Taylor's word it does, the very spirit of Christianity, imparts a peculiar moral glory to the age in which it is having manifestation—Christian philanthropy we instinctively feel—is simply outraged by picturings which libel both its principle and customary practices. So, when the pulpit is dealt with in a similar way, when morbid idiosyncrasies, anomalies or whimsicalities, sometimes having exhibition in it, are talked of, or blazoned over pages of description, in a way subtilly to insinuate that these are its normal and characteristic manifestations, there will be laughter, of course; but it is a laughter born of spurious wit. Such picturings infringe the laws of satire. They are, besides, of most malign effect, which genuine satire never is. The laughter they raise is indiscriminate, operates by a subtle process of unconscious attrition to wear away in the public mind that respect for the pulpit to which, on the suffrage of centuries it is entitled, and so does more than the most formidable argumentative attacks to abridge its influence and impair its usefulness: A syllogism can be answered, but there is no defense against a sneer.

The tax of patience to consider other ways in which the pulpit is assailed were, perhaps, unwise. It seems, however, out of place to close without alluding to a feature of the subject of vastly more concern than the amplest refutation of erroneous criticism—how, namely, one may so perform the work to which he thinks himself divinely called, as not, indeed, to silence criticism, but to afford it the least occasion possible for damaging animadversion. The call of God is to preach the gospel. This at once suggests how vital it is that the work of the pulpit be conducted with supreme loyalty to the truth given it to herald. Let the transcendent greatness of these themes be recognized. Let there be no question of the fullness and richness of their interest for man. Notwithstanding all the flippancies of unbelief in regard to their narrowness and poverty, let faith cling to the sure fact that they take hold of man in all his relations, intermingle with all his interests, individual, social, temporal and eternal. Let not the preacher forget that he bears divine commission to trace and press these great truths in all their diverse and ceaseless applications—to pour their light along the thoroughfares of life, to show them in relation to people's every-day pursuits—the things which occupy

"The talk

That holds with week day man in the hourly walk
Of the earth's business."

No pent-up sphere is his who ministers the word of life. Infinite realms he may traverse. The truths he is called of God to voice concern the present life, encompass it on every side, enter all its avenues, assert their influence everywhere—in its seats of power, its marts of trade, its countless occupations, on sea and shore, in youth and age; concern, too, and most of all the life which is to come; grasp the unseen and eternal, light man's way over death's vale and dark river to that blissful land where all we yearn for will be ours. Other truths, how they dwindle by the side of these!—these that wear and spread, filling time and stretching through eternal years. Oh, it seems

a little thing to say that the heralding of such truth to living, dying men is worthy to engage the preacher's best abilities—that no exertion possible to him can be innocently spared. With earnest zeal and melting love and persuasive speech, with all the aids that nature and learning can supply, should he give himself to the enforcement of these all-concerning verities upon his fellow-men.

II.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, DD., LL.D.

(An advanced chapter from his "History of the Reformation.")

THE Reformation of the sixteenth century and consequent separation from Rome led to a more spiritual and more liberal conception of the church, and to a distinction between the one universal church of the elect children of God of all ages and countries, under the sole headship of Christ, and the several visible church organizations of all nominal Christians. We shall trace here the gradual growth of this distinction.

In the New Testament the term *ἐκκλησία* (a popular assembly, congregation) is used in two senses (when applied to religion): 1, in the general sense of the whole body of Christian believers (by our Lord Matt. 16: 18); and 2, in the particular sense of a local congregation of Christians (also by our Lord, Matt. 18: 17). We use the equivalent term "church" (from *κυριακόν*, belonging to the Lord) in two additional senses: of a denomination (*e. g.* the Greek, the Roman, the Anglican, the Lutheran Church) and of a church edifice. The word *ἐκκλησία* occurs only twice in the Gospels (in Matthew), but very often in the Acts and Epistles; while the terms "kingdom of God" and "kingdom of heaven" are used very often in the Gospels, but rarely in the other books. This indicates a difference. The kingdom of God precedes the institution of the church, and will outlast it. The kingdom has come, is constantly coming, and will come in glory. It includes the government of God, and all the religious and moral activities of man. The visible church is a training-

school for the kingdom. In many instances the terms may be interchanged, while in others we could not substitute the church for the kingdom without impropriety: *e. g.*, in the phrase "of such is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5: 3; Mark 10: 14); or, "Thy kingdom come" (Matt. 6: 10), or, "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation, . . . the kingdom of God is within you" (Luke 17: 20, 21); or, "to inherit the kingdom" (Matt. 25: 34; 1 Cor. 6: 10; 15: 30; Gal. 5: 21); or, "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." A distinction between nominal and real, or outward and inward, membership of the church, is indicated in the words of our Lord, "Many are called, but few are chosen" (Matt. 22: 14), and by Paul when he speaks of a circumcision of the flesh and a circumcision of the heart (Rom. 2: 28, 29). Here is the germ of the doctrine of the visible and invisible church.

The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds include the holy catholic church and the communion of saints among the articles of faith, and do not limit them by the Greek, Roman, or any other nationality or age. "Catholic" means universal, and is as wide as humanity. It indicates the capacity and aim of the church; but the actualization of this universalness is a process of time, and it will not be completed till the whole world is converted to Christ.

The mediæval schoolmen distinguished three stages in the catholic church as to its locality,—the militant church on earth (*ecclesia militans*), the church of the departed or the sleeping church in purgatory (*ecclesia dormiens*), and the triumphant church in heaven (*ecclesia triumphans*). This classification was retained by Wicliff, Hus, and other fore-runners of Protestantism; but the Reformers rejected the intervening purgatorial church, together with prayers for the departed, and included all the pious dead in the church triumphant.

In the militant church on earth, Augustin made an important

distinction between "the true body of Christ" (*corpus Christi verum*), and "the mixed body of Christ" (*corpus Christi mixtum, or simulatum*). He substitutes this for the less suitable designation of a "twofold body of Christ" (*corpus Domini bipartitum*), as taught by Tichonius, the Donatist grammarian (who referred to Cant. 1: 5). These two bodies are in this world externally in one communion, as the good and bad fish are in one net, but they will ultimately be separated. To the true or pure church belong all the elect, and these only, whether already in the catholic church or outside of it, yet predestinated for it. "Many," he says, "who are openly outside, and are called heretics, are better than many good Catholics; for we see what they are to-day; what they shall be to-morrow, we know not; and with God, to whom the future is already present, they already are what they shall be hereafter." On the other hand, hypocrites are in the church, but not of the church.

It should be added, however, that Augustin confined the true church on earth to the limits of the visible, orthodox, catholic body of his day, and excluded all heretics,—Manichæans, Pelagians, Arians, etc.,—and schismatics,—Donatists, etc.,—as long as they remain outside of fellowship with that body. In explaining the article, "the holy church," in his version of the Creed (which omits the epithet "catholic," and the additional clause "the communion of saints"), he says that this surely means "the Catholic Church;" and adds, "Both heretics and schismatics style their congregations churches. But heretics in holding false opinions regarding God do injury to the faith itself; while schismatics, on the other hand, in wicked separations break off from brotherly charity, although they may believe just what we believe. Wherefore, neither do the heretics belong to the Church Catholic, which loves God; nor do the schismatics form a part of the same, inasmuch as it loves the neighbor, and consequently readily forgives the neighbor's sin." It is well known that this great and good man even defended the principle of forcible

coercion of schismatics, on a false interpretation of Luke 14: 23, "Constrain them to come in."

In the ninth century the visible Catholic Church was divided into two rival Catholic churches,—the patriarchal church in the East, and the papal church in the West. The former denied the papal claim of universal jurisdiction and headship, as an anti-Christian usurpation; the latter identified the Church Catholic with the dominion of the papacy, and condemned the Greek Church as schismatical. Hereafter, in Western Christendom, the Holy Catholic Church came to mean the Holy Roman Church.

The tyranny and corruptions of the papacy called forth the vigorous protest of Wiclif, who revived the Augustinian distinction between the true church and the mixed church, but gave it an anti-Roman and anti-papal turn (which Augustin did not). He defined the true church to be the congregation of the predestinated, or elect, who will be ultimately saved. Nobody can become a member of this church except by God's predestination, which is the eternal foundation of the church, and determines its membership. No one who is rejected from eternity (*præscitus*, foreknown, as distinct from *prædestinatus*, fore-ordained) can be a member of this church. He may be in it, but he is not of it. As there is much in the human body which is no part of it, so there may be hypocrites in the church who will finally be removed. There is but one universal church, out of which there is no salvation. The only Head of this church is Christ; for a church with two heads would be a monster. The apostles declared themselves to be servants of this Head. The Pope is only the head of a part of the church militant, and this only if he lives in harmony with the commandments of Christ. This conception of the church excludes all hypocrites and bad members, though they be bishops or popes; and it includes all true Christians, whether Catholics, or schismatics, or heretics. It coincides with the Protestant idea of the invisible church. But Wiclif and Hus denied the certainty of salvation, as taught afterwards by Calvinists, and herein

they agreed with the Catholics; they held that one may be sure of his present state of grace, but that his final salvation depends upon his perseverance, which cannot be known before the end.

Wiclif's view of the true church was literally adopted by the Bohemian Reformer Hus, who depended for his theology on the English Reformer much more than was formerly known.

From Hus it passed to Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, who agreed in denying the claims of the papacy to exclusive catholicity, and in widening the limits of the church so as to include all true believers in Christ. But they distinguished more clearly between the invisible and visible church, or rather between one true invisible church and several mixed visible churches. The invisible church is within the visible church as the soul is in the body, and the kernel in the shell. It is not a Utopian dream or Platonic commonwealth, but most real and historical. The term "invisible" was chosen because the operations of the Holy Spirit are internal and invisible, and because nobody in this life can be surely known to belong to the number of the elect, while membership of the visible church is recognizable by baptism and profession.

Important questions were raised with this distinction for future settlement. Some eminent modern Protestant divines object to the term "invisible church," as involving a contradiction, inasmuch as the church is essentially a visible institution; but they admit the underlying truth of an invisible, spiritual communion of believers scattered throughout the world. As Protestantism has since divided and subdivided into a number of denominations and separate organizations, the idea of the church needs to be further expanded. We must recognize a number of visible churches, Greek, Latin, Lutheran, Reformed, Anglican, and all the more recent Christian denominations which acknowledge Christ as their Head, and his teaching and example as their rule of faith and duty. The idea of denominations or confessions, as applied to churches, is of modern date; but is, after all, only an expansion of the idea of a

particular church, or a contraction of the idea of the universal church, and therefore authorized by the double Scripture usage of *ecclesia*. The denominational conception lies between the catholic and the local conception. The one invisible church is found in all visible denominations and congregations as far as true Christianity extends. Another distinction should also be made between the church, and the kingdom of God, which is a more spiritual and more comprehensive idea than even this invisible catholic church, although very closely allied to it, and usually identified with it. But we cannot anticipate modern discussions. The Reformers were concerned first of all to settle their relation to the Roman Church as they found it, and to reconcile the idea of a truly catholic church which they could not and would not sacrifice, with the corruptions of the papacy on the one hand, and with their separation from it on the other.

Luther received a copy of Hus's treatise *De Ecclesia* from Prague in 1519. He was driven to a defense of the Bohemian martyr in the disputation at Leipzig, and ventured to assert that Hus was unjustly condemned by the Council of Constance for holding doctrines derived from Augustin and Paul. Among these was his definition of the universal church as the totality of the elect (*universitas prædestinatorum*).

Luther developed this idea in his own way, and modified it in application to the visible church. He started from the article of the Creed, "I believe in the holy catholic church," but identified this article with the "communion of saints," as a definition of the catholic church. He explained the communion (*Gemeinschaft*) to mean the community or congregation (*Gemeinde*) of saints. He also substituted, in his Catechism, the word "Christian" for "catholic," in order to include in it all believers in Christ. Hence the term "catholic" became, or remained, identical in Germany with "Roman Catholic" or "papal;" while the English Protestant churches very properly retained the word "catholic" in its true original sense of "universal," which admits of no sectarian limitation. The Romanists have no claim

to the exclusive use of that title; they are too sectarian and exclusive to be truly catholic.

Luther held that the holy church in its relation to God is an article of faith, not of sight, and therefore invisible. But as existing among men the true church is visible, and can be recognized by the right preaching of the gospel or the purity of doctrine, and by the right administration of the sacraments (i.e., baptism and the Lord's Supper). These are the two essential marks of a pure church. The first he emphasized against the Romanists, the second against what he called Enthusiasts (*Schwarmgeister*) and Sacramentarians (in the sense of *anti-sacramentarians*).

His theory acquired symbolical authority through the Augsburg Confession, which defines the church to be "the congregation of saints in which the gospel is rightly taught, and the sacraments are rightly administered." Worship and discipline, rites and ceremonies, are made secondary or indifferent, and reckoned with human traditions which may change from time to time. The church has no right to impose what is not commanded in the Word of God. In such things everybody is his own pope and church. The Lutheran Confession has always laid great—we may say too great—stress on the unity of doctrine, and little, too little, stress on discipline. And yet in no other evangelical denomination is there such a diversity of theological opinions, from the strict orthodoxy of the Formula Concordiæ to every form and degree of Rationalism.

How far, we must ask here, did Luther recognize the dominion of the papacy as a part of the true catholic church? He did not look upon the Pope in the historical and legal light as the legitimate head of the Roman Church; but he fought him to the end of his life as the antagonist of the gospel, as the veritable Antichrist, and the papacy as an apostasy. He could not have otherwise justified his separation, and the burning of the papal bull and law-books. He assumed a position to the Pope and his church similar to that of the apostles to Caiaphas and the synagogue. Nevertheless, whether consistently or not, he

never doubted the validity of the ordinances of the Roman Church, having himself been baptized, confirmed, and ordained in it, and he never dreamed of being re-baptized or re-ordained. Those millions of Protestants who seceded in the sixteenth century were of the same opinion, with the sole exception of the Anabaptists who objected to infant-baptism, partly on the ground that it was an invention of the popish Antichrist and therefore invalid.

Nor did Luther or any of the Reformers and sensible Protestants doubt that there always were and are still many true Christians in the Roman communion, notwithstanding all her errors and corruptions, as there were true Israelites even in the darkest period of the Jewish theocracy. In his controversy with the Anabaptists (1528), Luther makes the striking admission: "We confess that under the papacy there is much Christianity, yea, the whole Christianity, and from thence has it come to us. We confess that the papacy possesses the genuine Scriptures, genuine baptism, the genuine sacrament of the altar, the genuine keys for the remission of sins, the true ministry, the true catechism, the Ten Commandments, the articles of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer. . . . I say that under the Pope is the true Christendom, yea, the very *élite* of Christendom, and many pious and great saints."

For proof he refers, strangely enough, to the very passage of Paul, 2 Thess. 2: 3, 4, from which he and other Reformers derived their chief argument that the pope of Rome is Antichrist, "the man of sin," "the son of perdition." For Paul represents him as sitting "in the temple of God;" that is, in the true church, and not in the synagogue of Satan. As the Pope is Antichrist, he must be among Christians, and rule and tyrannize over Christians. Melancthon, who otherwise had greater respect for the pope and the Roman Church, repeatedly expressed the same view. Luther came nearer the true position when he said that the Roman Church might be called a "holy church," by synecdoche or *ex parte*, with the same restriction with which Paul called the Galatian Christians

"churches," notwithstanding their apostasy from the true gospel.

Luther combined with the boldest independence a strong reverence for the historical faith. He derives from the unbroken tradition of the church an argument against the Zwinglians for the real presence in the eucharist; and says, in a letter to Albrecht, Margrave of Brandenburg and Duke of Prussia (April, 1532, after Zwingli's death): "The testimony of the entire holy Christian church (even without any other proof) should be sufficient for us to abide by this article, and to listen to no sectaries against it. For it is dangerous and terrible (*gefährlich und erschrecklich*) to hear or believe anything against the unanimous testimony, faith, and doctrine of the entire holy Christian church as held from the beginning for now over fifteen hundred years in all the world. . . . To deny such testimony is virtually to condemn not only the holy Christian church as a damned heretic, but even Christ himself, with all his apostles and prophets, who have founded this article, 'I believe a holy Christian church,' as solemnly affirmed by Christ when he promised, 'Behold, I am with you all the days, even to the end of the world' (Matt. 28: 20), and by St. Paul when he says, 'The church of God is the pillar and ground of the truth' (1 Tim. 3: 15)."

A Roman controversialist could not lay more stress on tradition than Luther does in this passage. But tradition, at least from the sixth to the sixteenth century, strongly favors the belief in transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the mass, both of which he rejected. And if the same test should be applied to his doctrine of solifidian justification, it would be difficult to support it by patristic or scholastic tradition, which makes no distinction between justification and sanctification, and lays as much stress on good works as on faith. He felt it himself, that on this vital point, not even Augustin was on his side. His doctrine can be vindicated only as a new interpretation of St. Paul in advance of the previous understanding.

Calvin, if we may here anticipate his views as expounded in

the first chapters of the fourth book of his "Institutes of the Christian Religion," likewise clearly distinguishes between the visible and invisible church, and in the visible church again between the true evangelical church and the false papal church, which he assails as unmercifully as Luther; yet he also admits that the Roman communion, notwithstanding the antichristian character of the papacy, yea, for the very reason that Antichrist sits "in the temple of God," remains a church with the Scriptures and valid Christian ordinances. So the Jewish synagogue under Caiaphas retained the law and the prophets, the rites and ceremonies, of the theocracy.

The Westminster Confession implies the same theory, and supports it by the same questionable exegesis of 2 Thess. 2: 3 sqq. and Rev. 13: 1-8.

The claims of the Roman Church rest on a broader and more solid base than the papacy, which is merely the form of her government. The papal hierarchy was often as corrupt as the Jewish hierarchy, and some popes were as wicked as Caiaphas; but this fact cannot destroy the claims nor invalidate the ordinances of the Roman Church, which from the days of the apostles down to the Reformation has been identified with the fortunes of Western Christendom, and which remains to this day the largest visible church in the world. To deny her church character is to stultify history, and to nullify the promise of Christ. (Matt. 16: 18; 28: 20.)

But the great merit of the Reformers is that they have broken down the tyranny of the papacy and destroyed its fundamental error and anti-Christian presumption which identifies the Roman Church with the universal church and with the Kingdom of God. Wherever Christ is—though only among two or three gathered in his name—there is the church and saving grace.

III.

THE SALOMON-A OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

BY REV. MAURICE G. HANSEN, A.M.

II.

THE opinions which for a long time were entertained concerning woman and her relative place in creation, were multiform and antagonistic. On the one hand there were those who degraded her to the animal kingdom, since she was made only to minister to the sensuous appetites of man; those who looked upon her as an abortion; those who denied that she had been made in the image of God, and even doubted her possession of a spiritual nature; those who claimed that her position is far below that of man, since her intellectual endowments and spiritual faculties are greatly inferior to his. On the other hand, there were those who acknowledged her intrinsic worth, and some even who, going to the opposite extreme of the execrable opinions that have been quoted, maintained that woman's true place is above that of man's, since she is indeed the ornament of creation and the best gift from God.

This singular controversy, long forgotten even by those who knew that it ever had existed, was revived in the middle of the seventeenth century by the appearance of a book in which it was attempted to prove, on Bible authority, that a woman is not a human being. The conflict broke out anew, being characterized by all the energy, zeal and passion that had been evoked by the discussion of this topic in former times. France, Spain, Italy and the Netherlands were flooded with books and pamphlets in support of, or reflecting, the assertion of the bold

author. Anna Maria Van Schurman felt prompted to defend her sex with all the genius she possessed. She did not indorse the statement of the Italian Lucretia Marinella, to the effect that God placed woman at the head of creation. On the contrary, she advised her sex not to read a book which struck at the roots of true womanly modesty. She acknowledged that the man had received the more excellent gifts. She refused, however, to admit that the weaker sex cannot attain to just as high an elevation as the masculine portion of the human race, within the domains of the arts and the sciences. And certainly, in her own person she was a noble illustration of the truthfulness of her assertion. Her correspondence with Prof. André Rivet, on this subject, was published in Paris in 1638. She followed it up with an essay marked by keen logic and metaphysical subtlety, in which she proved conclusively that even a Christian woman is permitted to strive after the highest achievements in all possible branches of knowledge. This work, which was immediately translated into French and German, was received with much enthusiasm. The praises which were lavished upon it stimulated her in the pursuit of the various sciences. Beverwyck and Catsius each gives a catalogue of the scientific studies in which she became eminent.

She understood physical geography, having read all the ancient and modern works on that subject. She became acquainted with the history of many countries, studying it carefully in their respective languages as well as in those of writers foreign to them. She acquired, moreover, a complete knowledge of political economy. Rhetoric, oratory and dialectics received her closest attention. In regard to the last, without which she claimed that many difficult parts of the Scripture could not be understood, she studied the works of St. Augustine, Damascene and other celebrated writers. A thorough familiarity with the most intricate departments of mathematics paved the way for the acquisition of astronomy. Whole nights she devoted to the study of that fascinating science. She viewed the heavens through the best instruments then constructed, and,

after tracing the courses of the heavenly bodies and measuring their dimensions and distances from each other, she would lay aside her books and her instruments, and meditate for hours upon the glory and the majesty of the Almighty Creator. As a botanist, a conchologist and a mineralogist she excelled. The herbarium and the collection of shells and minerals which she made not only contained the results of her laborious researches in the meadow, on the seashore, and among the rocks, but they were enriched also by contributions from the most distinguished specialists in various countries. She became a skillful anatomist and so thoroughly versed in medical science that the most competent physicians of the time consulted her upon difficult and perplexing matters arising in connection with their profession. Beverwyck solicited replies to a number of important questions relating to philosophy and physiology. The answers were furnished by some of the most learned men in the departments to which their discussions belonged. At the head of the list of the respondents whose essays were published is the name of Anna Maria Van Schurman. The theme proposed to her was, Why the Lord Jesus Christ, who frequently healed diseases merely by addressing a word to the afflicted person, or by simply touching him, employed a mixture of spittle and clay in the restoration of sight to the man who was born blind? Her discussion was in Latin and abounded in quotations from the works of the most eminent physicians. In her own mind she could not arrive at any definite conclusion. "Since the Lord restored sight," she wrote, "but did not practice the medical art, I am disposed to say, with Ambrosius, that the healing was not a work of art, but of power; with Socrates, 'Of this alone I am certain, that I know nothing about it;' and with Scaliger,

'Nescire velle quæ magister maximus,
Te scire non vult, erudita inscientia est.'

She also thoroughly mastered the history of philosophy. All the systems of the ancient and mediæval philosophers she investigated and compared with each other, until she thoroughly un-

derstood their analogies and their divergences. The systems of Plato and Aristotle she prized the most because of the use that was made of them, after the reformation, in the formulating of Christian doctrine. She gained a clear insight into the opinions of Des Cartes. She regarded this author as a man of genius, though she admitted that he had fallen into many errors. Not conscious of the feeling of hostility toward him which embittered the mind of Voetius against the erratic philosopher, she exchanged letters with him, and received him socially at her house, until one day when he forfeited the privilege by speaking in contemptuous terms of the Bible and of the Hebrew language. This was an offense the pious woman could not condone, and she refused to see him again.

Although her too close application to study brought on a fit of sickness which almost terminated fatally, she was hardly recovered before she might again be found among her books. It was perhaps through the incident of her illness that she became more deeply sensible of the inferiority of all secular wisdom in contrast with the supreme excellence of the knowledge relating to heavenly things. She therefore took up theology, and speedily became wholly absorbed in the grand themes which it offered for her inquiry and meditation. In her enthusiasm she called it "the holy of holies," "the crowning science," "the queen of all studies." Didactic, polemic, and practical theology successively received her careful attention. She prepared for herself a system of correlated doctrine, so that she might be able to view at a glance, as she expressed it, the treasures which this science spread out before her, and might be instantly reminded of the responsibility which her possession of them imposed. She became so well versed in it that she could wrestle, with the success possible to a finite mind, with the subtlest questions arising from it, and was able to argue with clearness and force upon some of the knottiest problems in the solution of which an intelligent, moral being cannot but feel greatly interested. Her acquaintance with the results of the exegetical labors of the early and the later writers was

amazing. Her own interpretations of difficult texts gave the plainest indications of a surprising familiarity with biblical antiquities, secular and ecclesiastical history, and theology in all its departments, as well as of a thorough knowledge of the ancient and the modern versions of the Scripture. The most learned divines not seldom came to her for instruction in regard to perplexing topics of exegesis, and, after receiving her opinions upon the subjects under examination, left her full of astonishment at the almost oracular wisdom of her utterances. Men like Salmasius, Lydius and Spanheim united in the testimony,

“Wie by haer wysheyt soeckt, sal wysheyt's schatten vinden.”*

She has been charged with a profound sympathy for the school of hair-splitting exegetes by whose frequent absurd definitions and distinctions the rich pastures of the Word of God were converted into barren wastes and its pleasant gardens into confusing labyrinths. In a French letter to Elizabeth, of Bohemia, she mildly yet firmly repelled the accusation. She admitted that the Scholastics had taught her much, but she also declared that her love of practical religion had protected her against the danger of losing herself among their vain and unprofitable speculations.

A single pamphlet from her pen on a theological topic has come down to the present. Beverwyck, the same who had solicited an expression of opinion concerning the design of our Lord in using clay and spittle in effecting the cure of the man blind from his birth, addressed to the most eminent philosophers and theologians in Europe the following inquiry: “The term of human life, in relation to the Divine decree, is it fixed or variable?” Anna Maria, who was included among those whose discussion of the theme was invoked, replied in a treatise composed in elegant Latin. Beverwyck immediately made a translation of it in Dutch, which he published at his own expense, and others rendered it into French and German.

* Who seeks for wisdom in her mind,
Its richest treasures there shall find.

Scholars everywhere lavished great praise upon this production, and Catsius composed in its honor a poem of considerable length, in which he remarks that, although she adduces all that the sages of Rome and Greece have written on the subject, her strongest arguments were gathered from the Holy Book of God, and that for that reason the position taken by her must be confessed to be an immovable one. The learned authoress asserted that the term of human life is unalterably determined by God. Her conclusion was not accepted by the Lutherans and the Remonstrants. The Lutheran theologian Dannhauer combated her in several counter-pamphlets, in one of which he hesitates not to style her "*Belgica Lachesis*," "*fatorum nutrix*," "*altera Clotho*," and, "*filia fati*."

Amesius, professor of theology at Franeker, the first, as has been stated, who taught in the Netherlands practical theology in relation to the conscience, exerted by his teachings so strong an influence upon Anna Maria, that she was induced gradually to abandon her predilection for the scholastic in theology, and to incline more and more decidedly toward asceticism, a transition which no doubt filled an important part in preparing her for her future intimate connection with Labadie and his followers. It was the change of residence by the family Van Schurman, from Utrecht to Franeker, which furnished the opportunity for an acquaintance with the Professor's teachings that led to this change of views. The stay, however, in the Frisian University city was of brief duration. It terminated at the conclusion of the medical studies of Anna Maria's brother, John Godschalk, for whose sake the temporary removal to Franeker had been undertaken. At his graduation the family returned to their former home, but in a condition of sad bereavement, for the head of it, the husband and father, had been taken from them by death, on Nov. 15th, 1623. The interment took place in the chancel of the Church of St. Martin, in Franeker. At the funeral-vault the affectionate daughter stood dissolved in tears. Very fondly attached to him, and strictly obeying him in all things, she realized at his grave more

strongly than ever, that what she was she owed in large part to his faithful instructions and wise guidance. It was perhaps, in reliance on this spirit of obedience in his daughter, that Frederic Van Schurman on his death-bed exacted from her a promise which, under the circumstances, she must have found it difficult, if not impossible, to refuse. He besought her most earnestly that she should "refrain from marriage, lest she should imprudently become involved in the snares of the world." The promise was sacredly kept. "Elle voua," said a French writer, "sa virginité à J. C., et elle lui garda en ce point une fidélité inviolable jusqu'à la fin." She herself expressed her feelings on this subject in the adoption of the motto of Ignatius which she wrote as one of the specimens of her skill in caligraphy, and, underneath it, a short Latin poem of her own composition :

A. M. S.

In symbolum suum,

Ὁ ἐρως ἔρως ἐσταυρωται.

Quis non sollicito Christum veneretur amore?

Quem simul Echo omnis conscia clamat. Amat.

Hic nos solus amat qui sanguine pascit amantes.

Tartaraque edomuit qui moriens. Oriens.

Hunc igitur sapiens casta pete mente puella

Nitereque hoc sponso, nec tibi fide. Fide.

After her return to Utrecht, the time which she could spare from her household duties which now began to press upon her, was spent in renewed study, in honoring her immense correspondence, and in the visits of respect and of condolence which even the great did not consider it a condescension to make. Among those who came from abroad, and would not return without the privilege of a conversation with her, was the Queen of Poland, who arrived at Utrecht on the Christmas evening of 1645. The next day, accompanied by the Bishop of Orange and by her court-physicians, Corrado and Jean le Laboureur, the Queen called upon the Lady Van Schurman. A circumstantial account of this visit is given by the last named in his "*Histoire du voyage de la reine de Pologne.*" Anna Maria conversed

in Latin with the Bishop on theology, and with Corrado in Greek, and with le Laboureur in Italian, on topics pertaining to their profession. The amazement of the Queen was increased as she beheld the marvelous specimens of the wonderful woman's skill in painting, engraving, embroidery and paper-cutting. Another Queen who called on her was Christina of Sweden. On this occasion Anna Maria disputed with a couple of Jesuit fathers who were present. At the close of the discussion they acknowledged themselves defeated in argument. "Are you not in league with a spirit?" they asked her. "Certainly I am," she replied devoutly, "with the Spirit by whom I live and breathe." Another intimate female friend of high rank was Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Frederick V. Elector of the Paltz, and Elizabeth Stuart. She was born in Heidelberg in 1618, a year which was remarkable for the breaking out of the dreadful thirty years war in Germany, and for the opening of the celebrated Synod of Dort. When her father went to Bohemia to assume the crown of that kingdom, the little girl remained at Heidelberg, under the care of the Electoral Princess Juliane, a highly gifted and spiritually-minded woman. When the Paltz fell in the hands of the enemy, the Princess and Elizabeth fled to Berlin, where the latter remained until her tenth year, when she rejoined her parents who had been compelled to take up their residence in the Hague. In this city Elizabeth and her two sisters, Louise and Sophia, received a most liberal education. It was during the residence of the family in the Netherlands that the eldest daughter made the acquaintance of Anna Maria, whom she immediately chose for her model. Many letters were exchanged between the two cultivated young women. Two of Anna Maria's are extant. One of these, dated Sept. 7, 1639, is on scientific subjects. The other, of Jan. 1644, is her protest against the philosophy of Des Cartes which Elizabeth had openly embraced. That there should have been the need for the sending of such an epistle is surprising on the ground that the young Princess refused, for religion's sake, the hand of the King of Poland who sought her in marriage. We shall meet

with this lady again a little farther on. Among Anna Maria's other correspondents was Anna de Rohan, a niece of Henry, Duke de Leon, who, during the reign of Louis XIII. was at the head of the Protestant party in France. It is greatly to be regretted that so much of the correspondence of Anna Maria is lost. She herself destroyed an immense number of her letters six years before her death. She no doubt committed this most deplorable deed under the impulse of the peculiar religious enthusiasm by which the last third of her life was characterized.

During the years 1652-55 she was in Cologne, having accompanied her two aunts, sisters of her mother, who had been called thither to attend to matters of personal interest. These ladies had fled from Germany to escape the horrors of the war, and had found a welcome refuge with Mrs. Van Schurman in Utrecht. While Anna Maria was in Cologne she had a conference with two Roman Catholic ecclesiastics of the Franciscan order and of high standing in the Romish Church. Sending an account of this conference as a matter of interest to her friends in the Netherlands, a rumor instantly was started and speedily spread through Europe that the learned and accomplished Anna Maria Van Schurman had been won over to the Roman Catholic faith. This report caused much distress to the subject of it, so that she felt disposed to prolong her absence from home. She was troubled more over the condition of the Church in Utrecht, which was torn asunder with intestine conflicts about the uses to which ecclesiastical property should be appropriated, and the right observance of the Sabbath. These matters had been debated with great acrimony by the professors of the Universities of Utrecht and Leyden, until finally the pastors and the congregations became involved in them. Indeed, the state of religion at Utrecht and throughout the Netherlands was very low. Anna Maria had no patience with the ministry as it was conducted in the city of her abode. She could not approve of those barren, protracted essays which were delivered as substitutes for gospel sermons, and

which, deficient in sound learning and in natural eloquence both, "in no way," as she expressed it, "tasted like, or were redolent with, the oil which the Spirit of Christ formerly poured into the hearts of His people." She loudly complained of these discourses, and denounced the inexcusable coolness of the men whom she could not regard as the servants of Christ, and whom she avoided as the betrayers of the Lord's grace and glory. She drew upon herself their bitter enmity. They sought to avenge themselves upon her. They spoke of her with contempt and belittled her extraordinary gifts. Composing burlesques upon her they made sport of her piety and slandered her to her neighbors. By these means they succeeded to some degree in detracting from her fame. Instead of returning, therefore, to Utrecht, she removed to Leksmont, where for some years she led a very quiet and retired life. It was there that her two aunts, who for twenty years had been in very poor health, and nearly blind, and who for this reason had been a great care to their devoted niece, died, the one at eighty-nine years of age, and the other at ninety. In the circumstance of her retirement, this bereavement pressed so heavily upon the tender-hearted Anna Maria, that she fell into a serious illness from which she recovered with difficulty.

In 1662 she returned to Utrecht, but in a little more than two years afterward was called to mourn the death of her favorite brother John Godschalk. After his graduation from the medical department of the University of Franeker, he had devoted himself to literary pursuits for which he had a strong inclination, instead of following his profession. He was not only a man of culture, but also of profound religious convictions. An oration which he delivered at Basle, Switzerland, in the Latin language, on "Practical Piety," was much praised. He made many tours through the continent, stopping at the principal places with the sole purpose of visiting prominent men of letters and conversing with them. Shortly before Anna Maria's return to Utrecht, he had started upon one of these journeys, and one which was destined to have a most important bearing

upon his sister's future life. He had scarcely reached home again when he was prostrated with the illness which proved to be his last, for he expired on Sept. 8, 1664, in his fifty-ninth year. The sick-chamber was constantly a scene of religious devotion, as the dying man testified to his friends of the glory of divine grace and of the peace of his soul, and called upon them to unite with him in singing Psalms XXIII and CIII, and also Simeon's Song of Praise in the temple. A few moments before his decease he crossed his already numb arms upon his breast, exclaiming, "I embrace my Saviour Jesus Christ in the arms of my faith." His last words were, "I come, Lord Jesus."

At this time Anna Maria, too, was fast drawing near the end of her life. Not quite fourteen years of it remained; but, in one particular, these fourteen years were the most remarkable of her course. She was, as has been stated, unmarried. Her nearest relatives had been taken from her by death. As already intimated she had learned to recognize the vanity of the fame and the adulation which her numerous accomplishments and her vast learning had procured her. By means of heavenly aspirations she sought to satisfy the inward craving of her soul, the deep hunger of her spirit. The ministrations of the Church in Utrecht, we have seen, gave her no help. She thought she knew with whom she could obtain that aid. There was one name she carried in her mind and upon her heart, though she had as yet never seen the man to whom it belonged. When on that last journey her brother was in Geneva, he lodged in the same house with Jean de Labadie. He listened to his private conversation, he was a rapt hearer among the countless throngs who hung upon the lips of the eloquent preacher, and he wrote many and long letters to his sister, in which he seemed to want for words to express his enthusiasm. Anna Maria read and re-read these epistles and concluded that Jean de Labadie was the true shepherd who led the sheep of the Lord into the green pastures and by the still waters of divine truth. Oh, that she, too, might be a member of the favored flock to which he ministered! It was not long before she entered upon a relation

which produced an entire change in her life, placed new weapons in the hands of her enemies and estranged from her even her best friends, but, to herself, became the source of the profoundest spiritual joy.

There never was a preacher about whom there was a greater diversity of opinion than Labadie. Some regarded him as a prominent reformer, a second Calvin, the salt of the earth, a city set upon a hill, a torchlight of truth in the darkness, a most noble man. To others he seemed one of the worst schismatics and heretics, an imitator of Böhme, a thistle in the Lord's garden, a withered grape on the Lord's vine, an extinguished candle on the Lord's candlestick, a fanatic, an idiot, a curse upon the Church. It must be admitted that since the reformation in Germany and in France there was no man who exerted a more positive influence upon Christian life on its practical and demonstrative side. For all that, the congregations which he formed have disappeared. His life is forgotten, his works are unknown, and even his name would doubtless have passed into oblivion were it not conjoined with those of his associates and successors who by their writings still appeal to the minds and the hearts of men. Spener's fame still survives, though Spener, the leader of the Pietists, was only Labadie's disciple. The fact that the disciple was a wiser and a more prudent man, perhaps accounts for this great difference in the duration of their respective reputations. Labadie was a great man in his piety, his intense earnestness, his all-consuming zeal, his self-sacrificing consecration; but in many respects his judgment was at fault, and thus he was led into errors by which very much of the good that he might have accomplished was wholly neutralized. Anna Maria Van Schurman became infatuated with him, as, in her opinion, the only ambassador of God to whom she could listen and whom she could obey, not only, but whom she was disposed to follow blindly as her spiritual guide. That such a man and such a woman formed such an ethereal friendship as caused the latter to regard it as the essence of her soul's happiness, even for the Lord's sake, to dwell constantly

in the near presence of this revered teacher, furnishes the materials for an interesting chapter in even ecclesiastical history.

Labadie was born at Bourges, in Guienne, on February 10, 1610. He was, therefore, not quite three years younger than Anna Maria. His birth occurred in an exciting period, for, three months before, King Henry IV of France had been assassinated. The elder Labadie, who was governor of Bourges, destined the boy for diplomacy, or the law, and sent him, when he was only seven years of age, to the Jesuit College at Bordeaux. As he gave indications of great intellectual power, and early manifested the profoundly serious disposition by which his whole life was characterized, the men who had charge of his education, determined, whether with, or without the wish of the parent, does not appear, to train him for the priesthood. After he had been admitted to orders, he became dissatisfied with the manner in which the Church treated the great questions of predestination, grace and human depravity. As he was engaged in studying the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers, side by side, a deep longing seized him to reform the Church upon the model furnished by the times of the Apostles and their immediate successors. Instantly seeking to gain adherents to his views, the burden of his preaching in cities and villages was "Repent." His ministry producing a great commotion, it was complained to the Archbishop of Bordeaux that he sustained the Reformation, pretended to fanatical visions, and aroused the enmity of the monks. Being summoned to reply to his accusers, he defended himself so ably that he was unanimously acquitted and was authorized to preach wherever he pleased within the bounds of the diocese. Breaking away from the order of the Jesuits, he began to labor at Paris. Pursued thither by his implacable opponents, he joined the Jansenists at Amiens, where he openly declared that he aimed to restore the Church to its primitive simplicity and purity, and that he desired that, according to the usages of the early Church, the Word of God should be preached and read, and that, in conformity with the original

institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Communion should be administered in both kinds.

Having succeeded in forming a congregation upon these principles, the Jesuits charged its members with being disturbers of law and order, and secured the attendance of a commissioner with full powers to investigate. This officer reported that he saw no evil in these persons. The Jesuits, however, persisted in their efforts, and finally persuaded Cardinal Mazarin to send Labadie and his assistant Dabillon to the south of France. There, too, he labored zealously in the diffusion of his views, and his enemies, chasing him from village to village, and from hamlet to hamlet, came near capturing him in the castle of Donsat, near Toulouse. He now made up his mind to leave the Church of Rome, a conclusion which he did not adopt until after a severe mental struggle. At Montauban, the seat of Protestantism, whither he had fled, he was received with open arms. During a residence, in that place, of seven years, he again made his influence felt. At the end of that time a bitter strife with the Roman Catholics, resulting from the interment of a person who had died in the Protestant faith, compelled him to leave, and he retired to Orange-Nassau, where the Church established in that Princedom gave him an earnest call to the pastorate.

In 1659 the army of Louis XIV threatened a siege, and in this event Labadie recognized an encouragement to accept a call from the French Church in London. Passing, on his way thither, through Geneva, he was invited by the Council to preach. He did so, and the impression produced was so favorable that he was immediately requested to remain in the city, provided the Church in London would consent. The latter church yielded its claims, and Labadie, locating in the city of Calvin, soon drew such large audiences that no building was large enough to hold the throngs that gathered to listen to him.

At this time the condition of the Church in the Netherlands was a deplorable one. The pulpit and the pew had alike be-

come deteriorated. The universities resounded with angry debates on abstruse questions of philosophy and theology. Pastors indulged in the bitterest invectives against each other, and affected the greatest absurdities in their ministrations. The manner of announcing the text Deut. iv. 1 may serve as an example: "The Mosaic Ocean, fifth well-spring, fourth painful, first drop." The people were a flock untended, unfed, and divided into parties which were arrayed against each other in the spirit of intense hostility. As a natural consequence, the cause of morality suffered and wickedness greatly increased. Only a few here and there studied the Word of God and practiced its precepts, and these, grieved in spirit, ceased not to cry, "Lord, how long!"

The tidings that Labadie might possibly settle in the Netherlands gave the greatest satisfaction. The congregation of Middelburg, in Zeeland, which had become vacant by the death of the pastor, Jean Le Long, had sent him a call. As it was known that Anna Maria had corresponded with Labadie, many persons immediately applied to her, in person and by letter, to use her influence in inducing him to accept the call. She complied with their request and joined with others in their entreaties. The Church of Geneva sought in every way to retain him, but in vain. Labadie listened to the overtures from the Zeeland Church, but was compelled to resort to a ruse to leave Geneva. A colony of eighty Waldenscs was about to remove from the Piedmontese valleys to the Paltz. Labadie asked leave of their leader to join their company with two of his disciples. No objection was made, but a difficulty arose in the fact that the permission to remove from Piedmont was restricted to the exact number of the travelers. In this dilemma Providence came to the rescue. Three of the colonists were prostrated with illness and could not go. Labadie and his two disciples assumed the peculiar dress of these persons and took their places in the ranks. After a short visit at Heidelberg, Labadie and his companions proceeded to Manheim, where they embarked on a small vessel, and, descending the river Rhine,

arrived at Utrecht. They received a very warm welcome and were duly installed as the honored guests of the Lady Anna Maria Van Schurman. Labadie's stay in this city was not prolonged beyond ten days, in which time he preached frequently, and to countless multitudes. His hostess was one of his warmest admirers. She eagerly caught every word that fell from his lips. Her dearest wish was to sit constantly, a humble disciple, at this Gamaliel's feet. Her old friend, Prof. Voet, counseled her to moderate somewhat her intense enthusiasm. She answered that she could not exist without the heavenly manna, the sweet spiritual nourishment which her teacher furnished. Scarcely had Labadie left Utrecht for Amsterdam, when Anna Maria and a few of her intimate female friends followed him thither, and when he appeared in that princely city before an immense audience, the learned lady of Utrecht was among his most expectant hearers.

It does not fall within the scope of this paper to give the history of this preacher, except in so far as it runs parallel with that of the subject of the sketch. The reader therefore is referred to the account, which I have elsewhere given,* of Labadie's experience in Middelburg, and of the cause of his expulsion thence and flight to Amsterdam. Encouraged in the latter city by the magistrates he immediately formed a society, composed of those who had followed him from place to place, of many of the citizens of Amsterdam, and of great numbers who from different parts of the land now joined him in the metropolis and permanently placed themselves under his ministry. It was independent of all ecclesiastical associations and government, and it was based upon the principles of purity of doctrine and morals as held and practiced by the early apostolic church, the standard with which "the New Church," as it was called, was to conform. At first, prominent men like Rochefort, Brakel and Koelman sympathized with the movement and regarded the apostle of a much needed spiritual reformation with

* The Reformed Church in the Netherlands, traced from A. D. 1340 to 1840 in short historical sketches, pp. 219-225.

great favor. Anna Maria Van Schurman was so taken with Labadie as a true servant of God and of His Church, so approved of the preacher's conduct,—for she had watched him closely from her home in Utrecht, in the conflicts forced upon him by the Reformed and the Walloon Churches,—so felt herself spiritually benefited by the unction of his ministry, that she could not live apart from him.

When, then, before long she received a letter from Pierre Yvon, a co-laborer of Labadie, urging her to come to Amsterdam and to follow his master, as formerly Paula and her daughter Eustachium had followed Jerome to Bethlehem, she at once resolved to obey. She sold her property at Utrecht, and, accompanied by a female friend and a maid came to Amsterdam. Failing in her efforts to find a suitable dwelling she applied to Labadie for advice. After informing her that the lower part of his own dwelling was occupied by a widow from Middelburg and her two female servants, he proposed that she should hire of them an apartment which he doubted not would be placed at her disposal. Anna Maria gladly complied, engaged the room, and became an inmate of the house in which the religious teacher resided whom she almost worshipped. As may be imagined, the intelligence of this step soon spread everywhere and evoked protestations and entreaties from her best friends, and among these, especially, from Professor Voet, who already before her departure from Utrecht, had attempted to dissuade her, saying that Paula and Eustachium could have obtained spiritual food of great excellence at Rome, without going to Bethlehem for it. The die was cast, the Rubicon crossed, and notwithstanding the earnest warnings of her friends and the malicious sneers of her enemies, Anna Maria persisted in the course she had adopted, and became wholly identified with the "New Church" and its leader. She called it a putting off the old man, and a putting on the new man, a crucifixion of herself to the world and of the world to her, the choice of the good part which no one could take from her. Henceforth all that she was, all that she had,—her magnificent

gifts, her splendid attainments, her social rank, her friends, her learning, her fame, her property,—all was devoted to the cause which she had embraced, represented by Labadie and his followers.

The municipal government of Amsterdam soon saw reason to regret the protection it had given to the new sect. As the result of the earnest and persistent labors of Labadie and his fellow-workers the numbers of adherents increased in that city, and societies were established also at Dordrecht, the Hague and Rotterdam; and abroad, in Wesel, Dusseldorf and Cologne. Anna Maria made every possible effort to make proselytes, and in many instances with success. The effect upon the established Church was soon apparent. It was reported that fifty thousand persons had seceded from it, refusing any longer to take communion with the Church which they learned to regard as the synagogue of Satan. The ministers began to preach with all their might against the Labadist opinions and conventicles, pamphlets denouncing their practices were printed in great numbers, burlesque pictures were displayed in the show-windows of the bookstores, and letters and warnings in other forms were incessantly addressed to Labadie. But of these things he took no notice whatever, continuing to preach in public, and privately to exhort and rebuke. When, however, Professor Voet openly attacked him in a Latin oration, delivered in the University on October 30, 1669, he replied with much animation in a French pamphlet entitled, "*Nouvelle conviction manifeste des calomnies.*" From that time on the wordy war was carried on between these two men with much zeal, and even Schurman had prepared, against her old friend and instructor, a defense of her idol, when the former was removed by death from the scene of strife. Two singular incidents now contributed to heighten the excitement and to increase the opposition against the seceding reformers of the Reformed Church.

As a result, doubtless, of the severe strain upon their minds caused by this continuous activity and by the persistent opposition directed against them, Labadie and Yvon were pros-

trated with sickness. They were scarcely recovered when Menuret, another zealous co-laborer, was seized with insanity to such a degree that he raved amidst the most violent contortions of his body, and had to be bound so that he should not injure himself and others. After one of these terrible convulsions he died. Instantly the rumor spread that Labadie, in a tempest of wrath against his unfortunate disciple, had thrown him down and stamped upon his breast until he expired. The authorities immediately investigated the affair, acquitted Labadie and declared the rumor a foul slander. But this righteous decision only the more provoked Labadie's enemies.

One of the female members of the society had died, and the coffin containing the corpse was placed in the front hall of Labadie's house, previous to interment in the grave which was being dug in the adjacent cemetery. "Here's where they kill people, and in that lot they bury them," cried a man as he looked in through the door and pointed to the newly-made grave. Instantly a crowd collected in front of the building, and a cloud of stones and other missiles was hurled against the windows. The house would have been razed to the ground if the authorities, calling out the military, had not scattered the crowd with a strong arm. The soldiers conveyed the body to the grave, and afterward for three days guarded the dwelling. During the assault Anna Maria was in the house; but, as she said subsequently: "I no more feared the surging and angry mob than one, standing on a rocky rampart, fears the beating waves at its foot,—such sense had we of the protection over us of our omnipotent and loving Heavenly Father."

As complaints laid before consistories, classes and synods multiplied, and appeals were made to the government to silence and drive out the pestiferous sect, Labadie and his followers resolved quietly to leave the city in which, for a short time, they had found a haven of rest. Having received a generous invitation to locate in Herford, they regarded this as a divine interposition in their behalf and greedily accepted it.

Herford, in Saxon Westphalia, was originally an abbey,

established by Louis, the Pious, as early as the middle of the ninth century, for the instruction of fourteen young women of noble families. By the successors of this emperor it was richly endowed, so that much territory in the vicinity came under its control, and a fine city of the same name grew up near its walls. During one of the incursions of the Northern Huns the abbey and the city were burned to the ground, but subsequently were re-built with greater magnificence. Princesses of the imperial family counted it an honor to preside over the abbey, which, with the lands under its sway, attained the importance of a principality which had its representatives at the German diet. In 1667 Elizabeth of Bohemia, the niece of Charles I. of England, and the sister of Charles Louis, Electoral Prince of the Paltz, assumed the office. As has been stated, she was the friend of Anna Maria, having made her acquaintance when, a fugitive from the Thirty Years' War, she was in the Netherlands.

In October, 1670, the Labadists, fifty in number, among whom the founder, his friend Lady Schurman, and several younger women of rank were prominent, embarked for Bremen. The voyage was a prosperous one, and was enjoyed by Anna Maria, who, herself in good health, did her best to minister comfort to those who were suffering from sea-sickness. From Bremen, where they were not permitted to tarry longer than two days, they traveled overland to Minden. At this place the court carriages of Princess Elizabeth awaited them, by which they were conveyed to Herford. The noble abbess greeted them very kindly; but the towns-people, on the other hand, who, on account of the rumors that had preceded them, were prejudiced against them, saluted them with volleys of stones and mud-balls. Moreover, the Lutheran ecclesiastics and the civil magistrates, resenting that the abbess had admitted the Labadists before previously consulting with them, were evil disposed toward the visitors, and drew up a formal complaint which they sent to the Elector. Elizabeth exerted herself to the utmost for the protection and the comfort of her

guests, and succeeded even in having the complaint dismissed and securing the quartering of a hundred dragoons upon the citizens of Herford, both as a measure of safety for the imperiled Labadists and as a punishment upon those who had dared to oppose them. We cannot follow in detail the adventures of the sect in this place, since our sketch has no concern with them any farther than as our heroine was connected with them. One incident, however, may be noted.

At Herford, as at home in Utrecht, Anna Maria received visits from prominent scholars and divines, who sought interviews with her for the purpose of consulting her upon topics of interest in regard to which opinions were divided. Thus Casper H. Sandhagen, rector of the school at Bielefeld, and Kracht, the Lutheran preacher of the cathedral at Herford, conferred with her concerning the thousand years' reign of our Lord. The result of this conference, which was held at the request of the Princess Elizabeth, is not given. Among the people of rank who called on her here was Charles, the eldest son of the Elector, and therefore the nephew of the presiding abbess. An interesting account of this visit, introducing to our notice the Lady Schurman and Labadie as they were seen by the distinguished visitors, we have from the pen of Hachenberg, the tutor of the prince. "The next day," he says, "we all went to the house of Labadie. At the entrance we met the Lady van Schurman. She was dressed in a homely garment, and she saluted us with a feeble kiss (*languido osculo*). We were conducted into a room in which many beautiful objects attracted our attention. These were pictures painted by this learned virgin, so excellent that in respect to correctness of representation they really rivaled nature itself. There were also images carved in wood and moulded in wax, so true to nature that we were amazed. As we, greatly astonished, were examining these master-pieces, an aged man entered and approached us with a slow and measured step. His emaciated features bore the traces of profound sorrow. His face appeared to us to reflect the divine thoughts that filled his soul.

His garments were plain. Evidently he was one of those mortals who are animated by a spirit which, exalted above all earthly objects, dwells in close communion with God. He greeted the young prince very kindly, and spoke highly of the piety of his aunt and of the merits of the illustrious Palatinate family. Then he discoursed at length and with great earnestness upon the love of God and the ignorance of man. No one could mistrust that this venerable man was Labadie, for the eyes of all were fixed upon him, and regarded him as if he were an Apollo making his utterances from the sacred tripod."

The stay of the Labadists in Herford did not last two years. Their enforced departure from this asylum was hastened by their own imprudence. The pastor had been preaching, on the resurrection of the Lord, a series of sermons which Anna Maria called "so heavenly that they withdrew us wholly from ourselves and caused us to consecrate to our Saviour ourselves and our possessions to the extent that we made an irrevocable sacrifice of our persons and our goods to His service, and gave up ourselves to be led by the same Word and Spirit by whom He has revealed Himself to us and made us in Himself His own." This meant that henceforth there was to be a community of goods upon the model of the believers of apostolic times. The adoption of this principle was celebrated by the administration of the Lord's Supper. On this occasion the devotees, in their extreme enthusiasm, leaped and danced, and flinging their arms around each other's necks, indulged in indiscriminate embraces and kisses. Yvon defended this unseemly proceeding on Scripture grounds, referring to the examples of Ex. xv. 20, and 2 Sam. vi. 12-17. Nevertheless a great scandal was caused by it.

The peculiar notion of the Labadists concerning the constitution of the marriage contract also gave great offence. It may be regarded as the logical consequence to which the mystical interpretation which they placed upon all the relations in life led them. Their leaders taught that marriage should be considered a divine institution, a spiritual union, a symbol of

the most exalted association with Christ, and that a civil ratification of it being not at all necessary, the contract was a valid one if only care were taken by the couple who had entered into it by mutual consent, that the society was duly informed of it. Labadie, Yvon and Du Lignon each took to wife, in this manner, a noble lady of their company. The noble abbess Elizabeth became very indignant when she learned this, and manifested her displeasure by ordering the removal of her state-chair from the chapel. She insisted upon the confirmation of these marriages by the civil power, and Labadie had the good sense to comply, though by this means he could not prevent the utterance and the printing of many scornful and derisive things against himself and his followers. The Princess did not wholly break with them, for when she received from her superiors the order to dismiss them, she exclaimed: "Wolten sie mir doch meine Gottes-Kinder behalten lassen."

Indeed the pressure which had been brought to bear upon the Abbess was very great. A secret complaint against the Labadists having been lodged with the council-chamber of the Empire, that they were Anabaptists and Quakers, that body demanded of her that, upon the penalty of a large fine and banishment from the empire, she should drive them as such from her territories, and it summoned the princess and five of the principal persons of the sect to appear before it within sixty days. Elizabeth was profoundly indignant against the Common Council of Herford by which the complaint had been entered. Having prevailed upon the Elector to issue the command that the complaint should be withdrawn without delay, she assigned to her Labadist friends Sondem, in Ravenberg, for their abode, and hastened to Berlin. Her guests expected her speedy return, but days, weeks and months elapsed and she came not back to them. Fearing that they no longer were welcome, they addressed a letter to her thanking her for her kindness and hospitality, and on June 23, 1672, departed for Altona, in

the Danish province of Holstein where, since 1601, religious liberty had been allowed.

It was not long before the poor wanderers found trouble in that city also. The Lutheran ministers were in the habit of collecting, on each Christmas day, a species of tax from all the inhabitants, including even the Jews. On the Christmas day of the year of the arrival of the Labadists, they imposed it also upon the new-comers, but were met with a decided refusal. The mayor was inflamed with anger and swore that before another Christmas the rebels should be expelled. Through the machinations of this man, aided by the clergy, the King was induced to issue a decree of expulsion. The Labadists declared their willingness to submit to this cruel measure, but begged that they should not be forced to depart in midwinter. The tender-hearted monarch took pity on them. Upon further investigation he granted their request, and then permitting them to remain, even took them under his special protection.

And now, at last, Labadie, seemed to have reached the fulfillment of his design to found a religious society upon the principles which he inculcated, and its members to have come to a haven of rest. The devotees were united together in the bonds of a true friendship. They had all things in common, and in honor they preferred one another. Anna Maria now was perfectly happy. She was named by all "Mother Schurman." She was relieved of her share of the household duties, so that she might be able to employ her splendid talents uninterruptedly in advancing the higher interests of the Society. Her facile pen, consecrated to the cause she had embraced, was never idle, and her literary activity during all the time of the residence in Altona, was very great. It was at this period that she translated into Dutch a collection of hymns composed by Labadie, wrote her fine poem on the future of Christ's Kingdom, which afterward was translated into the German language, and prepared her elaborate commentary on the first three chapters of Genesis. To many learned men abroad, among whom was John Owen, she indited

letters written in the purest scholarly Latin. Her most extensive work of those days is her *Eukleria*, written in Latin, and printed, in 1673, on the press of the Labadists in Altona. Friends and enemies concur in the sentiment that this book is "a precious gem, a costly jewel, a treasure for the intellect and the heart." Brakel called it "the most lovely flower which was cultivated in the garden of the Labadists." Divided into nine chapters whose headings clearly indicate the nature of the contents of the volume, the book gives the reader an insight into the inner life of the celebrated authoress, and thus explains to him much in the outward life that seems strange and startling. The headings are as follows: Chapter I—A general and correct exhibition of my past and present state. Chapter II—A particular representation of my early life, beginning at my infancy, in which I applied myself to piety, and was diligent in the effort to acquire a knowledge of the first principles of languages, the arts and the sciences. Chapter III—Concerning human knowledge, and the unfeigned judgment which I at present entertain in regard to it. Chapter IV—Concerning theology, the practice of piety, the manner of praying, and my former mode of observing the Sabbath. In this connection I treat of the character of the Old and the New Testaments. Chapter V—Concerning the Evangelical Church and other conventions of a very diverse character, and concerning the surprising secret paths by which Divine Providence brought me to the true Evangelical Society. Chapter VI—the narrative of my past life is resumed, and my entrance into my present condition is set forth. Chapter VII—Concerning my removal to Amsterdam, and my closer union with the revived pure church. Also a history of some events that occurred about the time of the first meetings. Chapter VIII—Concerning our departure from Amsterdam and our journey to Herford; our arrival there; our stay in it, and our departure to a country-seat of the Princess. Chapter IX—Concerning our arrival in the city of Altona, belonging to the King of Denmark, and of our residence here until the present moment.

While the book was praised throughout the entire literary world on account of the purity of its Latin and the beauty of its style, it provoked opposition from those who claimed that it was pervaded with the spirit of Labadism, and who for that reason did not hesitate to pronounce it the product of an old woman in her dotage. But contempt is not argument and sometimes recoils upon those who can wield no other weapon. Many divines, both of the Reformed and of the Lutheran churches, seriously applied themselves to the refutation of the position taken by the distinguished authoress as to the manner of keeping the Sabbath. She declared that all days alike must be consecrated to God in the way of spiritual worship and holy activity; that the ceremonial injunction apparent in the command concerning the Sabbath is abolished; and that henceforth men must defer only to the Spirit who is the infallible Interpreter of the law of God. Such a conception of the nature of the Sabbath, although an erroneous one in many essential particulars, admits of a manner of treating it for its correction, more worthy than the application of irritating epithets to the person who holds it.

While Anna Maria was engaged upon this work, the Society was overtaken with the calamity which had threatened it for some time. Its leader had been prostrated with a severe illness, from which, however, he recovered sufficiently to resume his preaching and writing. His renewed exertions caused a relapse, and seven days afterward he died in the arms of his faithful disciple and friend, Lady Van Schurman. His last utterance was, "Thy will be done from everlasting to everlasting." He was in many respects a very remarkable man. His piety was unquestionable and of a profound order. His great grief at the coldness, the formality, and the worldliness of the Church was creditable to him. His error was in his breaking away from all ecclesiastical ties. He has been regarded as standing in a middle position between Spener and Zinzendorf. Many opposed him bitterly, but many also recognized his excellent traits, and among them such honored names as Brakel,

Lampe, and the two just mentioned. His life contributed much material to Max Goebel's "*Geschichte des Christlichen Lebens.*" A last will and testament, prepared by Labadie during a severe attack of sickness, which, however, did not prove to be the last, was introduced by Anna Maria in the second volume of her "*Eukleria.*" It is a noble monument to the devoutness and the self-sacrificing zeal which characterized the whole course of its author. He passed away on his sixty-third birthday, February 13, 1673.

Pierre Yvon, who was to Labadie what Beza was to Calvin, Melancthon to Luther, and Spangenberg to Zinzendorf, succeeded as the head of the little band at Altona. He was held in the highest esteem by the celebrated Vitringa, who wrote about him after his decease, "The memory of the sainted Yvon, a faithful servant of Jesus Christ, shall be precious to me on account of his extraordinary piety and learning, his astuteness in discerning the ways of God, our mutual affection, and a distant relationship between us which indeed I regard as an honor." At his side was the now gray-haired Anna Maria, whose utterances were regarded by the Society as almost oracular, and to whom he himself looked for counsel. She was still in the full use of her amazing mental powers. By means of her wise instructions, her affable behavior and her kind and helpful ways, she exerted the greatest influence upon those with whom she had cast in her lot. By means of her correspondence with persons whom her reputation had already drawn toward her she persuaded quite a number from abroad to unite with the Society. Among them was a noble woman from The Hague, between whom and the prophetess, as Anna was called, a friendship was formed so strong that when the former died within a year after she came to Altona, Anna Maria put in writing a wish to have her own body interred by the side of that of her beloved sister.

The Lutheran pastors who, as has been seen, made an unsuccessful attempt to effect the expulsion of the Labadists from Altona, at last were gratified by their departure from the city.

Yvon learned that war was about to break out between Sweden and Denmark, and he determined to remove with his flock to a place of safety. Hamburg was selected; but just then a pressing invitation was sent to the society by Cornelius Van Arssen, the Governor of Surinam, to occupy his castle of Waltha near Wiewerd, in Friesland. The buildings were large, and were defended by thick walls surrounded by a triple moat. The invitation was accepted, and five brethren were sent in advance to put a number of rooms in order for Yvon and the most aged and feeble members, among whom was Lady Van Schurman, who were to follow them as soon as practicable. The sea voyage of the latter party almost had a tragical ending, for the vessel which conveyed them was tempest-tossed and came near being wrecked. But not even within the solid fortifications of Waltha could a permanent refuge be found. The States of Friesland received numerous communications in which the Labadists were denounced as schismatics, and their doctrines were declared to be exceedingly pernicious, and they were informed that the Reformed Church was greatly imperiled by the fact that the secession ideas of the Labadists were spreading, and that many proselytes were constantly joining the ranks of the latter. Accordingly they appointed a commission to confer with Yvon. To the twenty-three questions which were laid before the leader, he answered so satisfactorily that, upon the recommendation of the learned Witsius, of Franeker, the States resolved to permit the Labadists to hold public worship and to grant them all the privileges of the Reformed Church. This, however, was not to the mind of the ministers, who wished to see the Labadists restored to the bosom of the Church, or, on the other hand, wholly suppressed. Even Brakel, who formerly was a warm friend of Anna Maria, took sides with these opponents, and from his pulpit at Leeuwarden denounced the followers of Labadie as errorists. While these conferences and discussions were in progress, the aged "prophetess" still drew around her many distinguished men. England added to her visitors in the persons of William Penn,

Fox and Barclay, who spent much time with her in conversation upon religious topics.

And now the end had come also for this truly remarkable woman. For some months she had been suffering severely from gravel and gout, which caused her excruciating pains, under which, however, she retained her clearness of mind and enjoyed an unwavering cheerfulness of spirit. She drew the last breath on May 4th, 1678, dying in the full confidence of Christian faith and hope. A few moments before she expired, a member of the society said to her: "Be of good courage, dear sister; in a little while you enter eternity." She replied: "In eternity,—in eternity,—said our beloved father, Labadie," The quotation of these words, spoken by her revered friend and pastor, and recalled by her in this extreme hour, never was completed.

There always have been people, and there are some to-day, who regard a learned woman as an anomaly. Her superior culture is supposed to unsex her, at least in respect to the charms and the graces peculiar to the feminine character. The development of her mind, by which she has been elevated above her sisters, and even above the majority of the sterner sex, is thought to have been at the expense of that which is gentle and lovely in woman, and to convert her into a monster curiously unique and undoubtedly repulsive. The very idea of wedding a learned woman and installing her as the mistress of the home is enough to make many men shudder. They would as soon think of embracing a glittering icicle or cherishing a bundle of wormwood. Anna Maria Schurman did not escape the treatment to which any who entertained such sentiments in her day deemed themselves justified in subjecting her. It was, perhaps, in this spirit that one of her biographers, Tomasius, made an assertion which has been widely copied, that she was fond of eating spiders. The thing, shocking as it is, is not wholly improbable as an eccentricity, for the writer of this sketch saw a young lady of education and refinement, as she stood before an ant-hill in the woods on a bright summer

day, selecting from the teeming, tumbling mass the largest and the fattest insects, and, distinguishing between the sweet and the sour, eating them with evident relish. Apart from this single author's statement, there is no authority for the opinion that Anna Maria was addicted to any such disgusting tastes as these, nor is there any good ground for the opinion that she was deficient in those attractions of disposition and manner which render a well-trained woman the ornament of social life.

We have seen that it was owing to an absorbing affection for her father, which had its expression in a supreme regard to his wish, that she remained in a state of celibacy. The principles of religion which very early were inculcated, were predominant in all her career, but especially, and as can be expected in every instance of healthy developement and growth, in the latter half of it. Not only by her writings, but by her behaviour she showed that she was a good Christian. A sentence in a letter which she sent from Altona to one of her friends in the Netherlands is significant. "Let us not, like so many so-called pious people, be deceived by correct opinions, emotions, desires, prayers, and devout practices, and by what are named deeds of love, *which are not animated by the Spirit of Christ, have not for their rule the will of God, and aim not at the highest honor of the Divine Being.* These three conditions comprise very much to those whom God enables to understand them and to illustrate in their daily walk and conversation."

She was in the habit both mornings and evenings, personally to lead in the family devotion. Besides, three times a day she had her stated seasons of private communion with her Father and Saviour. Until the change in her views of the manner of keeping the Sabbath, resulting from her acceptance of the teaching of Labadie on this subject, she was very punctilious in her observance of that day, after the example of Brakel who refused on Sunday to touch a morsel of food which had been purchased or cooked after eight o'clock on the preceding Saturday evening.

While her mother was living, and Anna Maria could devote herself to her studies and her numerous accomplishments, the

house was a temple of the Muses, from whose precincts those who were inclined to frivolous pursuits and were fond of gossip and offensive scandal naturally excluded themselves. But after the decease of the elder lady, the burden of domestic care fell upon the daughter and she was compelled to contract the time formerly given to her books, and to break off to a great measure a correspondence which had grown to vast proportions. We have seen with what faithfulness she cared for her aged, invalid aunts. Besides these sick at home, she charitably sought out and attended to the ailing destitute in the humbler parts of the city of her residence.

She was not without faults, such as she failed not to acknowledge, and as she grew in grace, greatly deplored. In her childhood modesty was a lovely trait of her character. But the lustre of that gem was for a time dimmed by the breath of a high-sounding and unceasing adulation. When renowned authors, poets, scholars, artists, scientists abroad, wafted toward her their laudations, vying with each other in doing her honor; when at home such men as Brakel, Schotanus, Hoornbeek, Voet, Rivet, and others equally distinguished filled her ears with their extravagant praises, she became vain and self-glorious. But this idol she learned to renounce, and she bewailed with many tears the weakness that had prevented her from resisting its seductions.

She has been charged with a lack of self-control. The mention of a single incident suffices as a refutation of this accusation. She had spent thirty days of constant and arduous labor in fashioning in wax a superb embossed bust of herself. In an evil moment one of her aunts carelessly allowed it to drop from her hands. As it struck the floor it was shattered into small fragments. When informed of the occurrence, Anna Maria quietly observed, "In the poem which I affixed underneath, I called it a fragile piece of art. Still I had no idea that it was destined to perish so soon. Why do we place our affections upon transitory things, since, as Pindar has well remarked, 'we ourselves are only the shadows that are seen in our dreams.'"

It is a signal illustration of the vanity of all earthly renown that the spot cannot be identified, even within such narrow limits as the little church-yard at Wiewerd, where the body of this truly remarkable person was committed to its last resting-place. Under the church is a funeral vault which is noted, like one at Bremen, and another at Bonn, for the reason that the corpses placed in it do not decay, but in their coffins become desiccated, and in this dried condition retain their outline intact. In 1765 the vault was opened, and in it was found the corpse of a woman swathed in a very costly shroud. Instantly it was surmised that this was the body of the famous Lady Anna Maria Van Schurman, and crowds gathered from all parts of the land to view it. Mr. A. F. Van Schurman, a lineal descendant of the family, denied that the corpse was the body of his distinguished ancestor, since, according to a desire which she had expressed, her remains had been placed in a cavity which had been dug under the church wall, and in such a position that the head, facing the east, was outside the wall, and the body within the enclosure. This statement was confirmed by the Reverend Mr. Schotsman, minister at Leyden, who, however, added that the body, after remaining interred thus for a number of years, was taken up and placed in the vault, which, at the time of Anna Maria's death, was not yet ready for the reception of the dead. His authority for this latter assertion was the sexton of the church, who, in 1800, had held the office for fifty-two years and had been preceded by two incumbents who each had performed its duties for a term lasting half a century, the tradition thus going back to a date within thirty years before the decease in question.

Differing from these two statements is that of a venerable resident of Wiewerd, who said that the lady had been buried near the northeastern corner of the church, and that in his youth his father had shown him the grave.

The Lord knows the places where the dust of His own rests, and from them, wherever they may be, He shall raise it up at the last day in forms of resurrection-glory.

IV.

EVERY CHRISTIAN A PRIEST.

BY REV. W. J. SKILLMAN.

IDEAS naturally precede definitions, just as in practical affairs principles operate long before they can be formulated. An instance of this, immediately at hand, is furnished us in this subject of the Christian Priesthood. The sacerdotal position of believers, individually and universally, is indicated very early in the Scriptures, nevertheless the doctrine lies comparatively latent there and only comes into anything like definite statement again as the canon of the New Testament is very near its close. Yet this doctrine is one which pervades Revelation, and, when fully discerned, is seen to stand vitally connected with the whole body of redemptive truth. Far too commonly neglected is it for so greatly important a doctrine as it is. Every Christian is a Priest. In some aspects this statement certainly involves as distinctively a Protestant or Reformation dogma as the more famous *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*. At all events it is clear that no appellation of richer meaning, nor one more comprehensively suggestive is ever bestowed in Scripture upon believers. To no higher dignity can they be elevated. Therefore it can hardly be unprofitable to note the place this doctrine holds in the Word of God and to strive, so far as we can, to attain unto the ground-idea therein.

Once in the Old Testament and five times in the New are the people of God spoken of expressly as "Priests," or as

constituting a "priesthood." To the host of Israel, then gathered at the foot of Mt. Sinai, Moses represents Jehovah as saying, "If ye will obey my voice, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." (Ex. xix. 5, 6.) This is the single passage in the Old Testament where this designation is used. Turning to the New Testament, we have, two passages in the first epistle of Peter and three in the Revelation of John. Peter (1 Epis. ii. chap. 5-9,) writing to Christians in general, twice—but in the same connection—calls them a *ἱερότευμα*, "a priesthood"—first "a holy priesthood" and then "a royal priesthood." And in John in the Revelation, (i. 6, and v. 10), they are "priests unto God"—*ἱερεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ*—and (xx. 6) "priests of God and of Christ"—*τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. Virtually, however, these New Testament passages are but three, making but four statements in the entire Word of God explicitly of this character. And further we remember that both Peter and John are evidently quoting from Moses, or writing in plain allusion to the word in Exodus, so that there is an exceeding small residuum of express or direct teaching in the Bible on this subject.

But what is the significance of this teaching?

In order to a satisfactory answer, two or three things are imperatively needed. First there is need of a clear understanding of the exact gist of these passages—their purport and precise point: and, since believers are called "priests," it is necessary to know just what the word, "priest," means, or what are the contents of the term: and lastly, how precisely this term is applied to believers.

What, then, is the specific intent, in each case, of these writers—of Moses, first, and then of Peter and John?

A slight examination will show that they all have the same end in view. Moses is plainly seeking to convey to the people of Israel some adequate impression of the exalted position which they, as a people, occupy in their

relation to Jehovah and as compared with all the other people of the earth. Israel is represented as the peculiar treasure of Jehovah—a special, particular property of his, bound to him by a unique bond of ownership—a holy people, a nation chosen as the first born of the race and set apart for God and for God's uses in the earth. It is in this line that the people are spoken of as "a priestly people." They are more than that. In the phrase of Moses, they are "a kingdom of priests"—ממלכת כהנים—which according to Oehler, may be rendered, "a priestly kingdom." So in fact the LXX has it—*βασιλειον ιερδρευμα*. Significantly the language of Peter and John in the New Testament, corresponds in all the minuter particulars with this language of Moses in the Pentateuch. Peter designates Christian believers as "a royal priesthood," as said—*βασιλειον ιερδρευμα*—the very word of the LXX, perhaps before the eye of the writer, as certainly it was before his mind, as he wrote. And it is noteworthy also that in each of the passages wherein John speaks of the priestly dignity of Christ's people, he associates along therewith this idea of kingship. In the two opening passages in the Revelation they are a "kingdom"—*βασιλειαν*—and in the closing passage (xx. 6) though they are not expressly called, "kings" neither are they simply "priests," but they are priests who rule—"priests of Christ who shall reign with him."

Now what is the object of this language and what the force of it? From the context in each case, it is evident that both the patriarch and the two evangelists, or apostles, are laboring, as said to convey an idea of the high place under God in which his people stand. It is not needful to enter into minute details merely to show how this is. In both cases, however, in the Old Testament and in the New, the wonders of God's electing grace, wherein he chooses a people out of all others to be his people, is the strong primary thought. "Israel is my son, even my first-born"—so Jehovah bids Moses say to Pharaoh, in the opening of Exodus, (iv. 22.) and so Peter inscribes his epistle to "the elect according to the foreknowledge of God," (i. 2.) and

in immediate connection with the ascription to them of a priestly position, declares that they are "a chosen generation"—*γένος ἐκλεκτόν*. In accord with excellent authorities, it may be affirmed that there is perhaps here an intimation of the priestly position virtually of the whole Jewish nation, as related to the gentile nations of the earth, and of the priestly position of the whole Christian body, as related to the world, afforded in these passages. That idea, however, is not followed up, either as respects the Jews or as respects the Christian church. The nation as a nation very evidently was not priestly, nor is it the church as the church that is so. It is the church that is within and behind and underneath the church—God's invisible kingdom in the world, in fact, is the only really priestly kingdom. The true people of Jehovah, the true people of Christ, or veritable believers—to them alone is this honor, as Peter so explicitly says—*ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν*.—(1 Pet. i: 7.)

By the ascription of combined priestly and royal dignity to God's people, it is to be concluded, therefore, is meant that they are called to occupy the highest place in God's regard and to engage in the very noblest service under him. This, in general terms. But, it may be inquired, is anything more meant? Is there anything specific here? That is a thing that can only be determined by determining a question prior thereto, namely, What is a Priest? Etymologically and in every other way this word needs to be looked at. Sufficiently common is the term in both the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, so that there can be no difficulty in arriving at the force of it in its common acceptance; but the root-idea therein must also be known, or, so far as possible, what, to the very last, are the final contents of the term.

As met with in vulgar usage, no word, in a religious connection, is employed with more looseness than the word "priest." With masses of people, the name serves simply to call to mind a well-known Roman Catholic official, or one holding a like position in some of the other religions of the world. At the

Reformation the designation was largely discarded because of the false conception of the work and the place of the Christian ministry which it carried along with it; and where retained among the Protestants, it was with the clear understanding that the priest was not a priest in the Bible-sense of the term, but merely in the strict philological sense of the word as adopted into Christian nomenclature—that “priest,” in short, was just minister, pastor, elder, *i. e.* πρεσβύτερος, presbyter, prester, priest. Still the retention of the term led to trouble; little by little, the old idea returned, so that we find Spener in his “*Pia Disideria*,” complaining that the clergy of his time assumed to be a “priesthood” in all the fulness and implication of the old Roman idea. Indeed, the pietistic revival in Germany at the close of the seventeenth century, with which Spener was so identified, had, as one of its primary objects, the restoration of the true conception of the universal priesthood of believers—though the conception at the time was, in some quarters, pushed to a fanatical and dangerous extreme.

The idea of a priestly ministry in the Christian Church is something utterly untenable—there is rightly no such priesthood. In all the New Testament there is no intimation that the ministry are to hold a specially priestly position or that they are to exercise priestly functions in distinction from the people. Never are they called priests—not once is the term *ιερευς* so applied. A score of honorable titles are bestowed upon them and upon their office, but not a declaration or a hint is there to show that they are priests in any sense different from what all believers are such. As Christians they are as much priests out of the ministry as in it. Moreover, it would not be hard to show that this priestly idea, like every other perversion of the truth, in proportion to the greatness of the truth perverted, must and always does prove pernicious.

The question, however, to return, is not, Who are *not* priests? but, What is a priest? Etymology really affords little help. The Hebrew כֹּהֵן, in its ordinary usage, is simply “a priest” and that is nearly all that can be made of it, though

the verb קָם meaning, in the most radical conception of it, "to stand," may afford a fruitful hint. Gesenius finds in the Arabic the cognate radical, lost in the Hebrew, which means to vaticinate, or foretell as a soothsayer, having at its basis the idea of mediation. Bähr also connects it with an Arabic root, meaning "to draw near." The Greek and Latin equivalents indicate merely a sacred person. The ground-idea of the term, in all the more ancient languages, seems early to have given way to the vague and merely general conception of a religious person or one who officiates in a religious service. But if the conjecture of Gesenius be right that the basis of the idea in the Shemetic languages is that of mediation, and that while the Arabs retained one *prims* element in that thought of mediation, the prophetic namely, and the Hebrews the other, the strictly priestly—if this be so, then in etymology even one lays hold on the very foundations of the truth here. It is not difficult to be persuaded very strongly of this. For whether these conjectures in Shemetic etymology be right or not, the root or ground-idea connected with the universal usage of the word in Revelation is evidently that of mediation. The priest is one who "stands"—stands before God—he "draws near" to God; he is "set apart," "a sacred person," in both the Hellenic and the Latin idea, for the furthering of man's highest ends. This is the plain thought of the Bible, and is borne out by all the evidence coming from extra-biblical sources.

Pushing the inquiry further, it may be asked, What is this Mediation-Conception as found in Scripture? Is it not, it may be queried, evidently triune in nature? Is there not virtually in it always, in other words, the prophetic idea, the kingly idea, and the priestly? See: the king is one who "stands" between God and man to rule—ruling, of course, with derived authority, *in loco Dei*. So the prophet "stands" there to teach. He is not, after the careless, popular conception, merely one who foretells or presents future truth. The veritable God's prophet is one who teaches God's truth whatever the temporal relations of it, whether it respect past, present,

or future. And so the priest also "stands" in that same place between God and man, not as a ruler or as a teacher, but as a reconciler, to do the completing and what, by every consideration, must be viewed as paramountly the essential work in mediation, the preliminary and foundational work therein, namely, to close the yawning, separating chasm between man and his Maker caused by sin. Nor let the correlative and beautifully complementary character of the relation reciprocally existing especially between prophet and priest be passed here unnoted. As the prophet stands, for example, between God and man to teach, or looking, as it were, from God manward, so, on the other hand, the priest stands between God and man to atone and intercede, that is, looking from man Godward. To reason out all this matter fully, however, or in minute detail from Scripture, there is not room, but perhaps it is sufficiently indicated what is to be understood of the nature of priesthood, getting down to what is the initial and controlling, the germinal and fructifying idea in it. A priest, in short, is one who fulfills the fundamental and most essential part of the work of mediation between God and man.

But here a point is reached which is certainly pivotal: Jesus Christ, namely, is the Priest of all priests. In Him all other priesthòods are included, and, as foreshadowing His priesthood, or as derived from it, in Him all other priesthòods get their force. In the priesthood of Christ alone can be learned the significance of the priesthood of the worshipper—in fact, all that pertains thereunto or that throws light upon that, since therein is to be learned the significance of worship itself, wherewith the priestly idea from age to age has been inextricably entwined.

It would unquestionably prove of interest to show point by point what a flood of illumination is poured upon this subject from a review of the person, life, teaching and work of Jesus. But it is clearly from the recognition of Him, or of the Messiahship or the Christ-idea in Him brought out in its fulness, and of the one only efficient because divine priesthood which is His,

that men from the beginning have had any access to God at all. True worship, from the first hour to the present one, has been throughout essentially the same—possible only through mediation, and never has there been but one mediator. Worship, as shown in Christ, is, in fact, simply going to God. Let men put it in whatever phrase they please, yet it always comes to that. It is the soul's response to God, to the calls and claims of winsome divine love. It is the yielding of man's life in principle and action, in motive and conduct, to the attractive forces or influences which are perpetually poured forth from God, as light and heat are poured from the sun. God calls, man answers; God woos, man responds; God bids, man obeys; God says "come," man comes—this is worship. It is going to God. So much is clear.

Now it is universally conceded that the primal design of God for our race, as made known in Scripture, was that of unobstructed communion with himself. This is the idea presented in the account given of Eden and of the Fall of man. After the Fall mediation became necessary. This mediation, at the first, and for ages after, was through the father of the family. He stood *in loco Dei* to His household—a prophet or teacher, a priest or intercessor with God in behalf of that household, and a king, or ruler and defender therein. But the priest, whether of the single household, as Noah or Abram, or whether tribal, as, perhaps, was Melchizedec, could not come to God empty-handed. Some offering must be brought. And the accepted offering from the day of Abel, there is every reason to believe, was in nature sacrificial. From the opening word in Genesis to the closing one in the Revelation, there is, throughout, unmistakably written, the requirement of the shedding of blood. Man, as a sinner, cannot approach God without some propitiatory sacrifice. But every sacrifice pointed clearly to the Lamb, God's own offering for sin; so every sacrificer, Father, Abel, Noah, Melchizedec, that is, every priest, and every prophet, too, and every king—every anointed one—pointed on to the Messiah or the

Christ, the real or veritable and all-efficacious Anointed One, the true prophet, priest and king.

Jesus Christ is not only the real and only priest, but, as intimated, He is also the gathering up of all the significance and essence of worship. Everything of this nature, first and last, finds its explanation in Him. He is the pure Medium in which every element of true religion is held in clear solution. This is so, not only of the special and more formal Jewish economy, or period of developement, but clearly, also, of the broader, patriarchal dispensation preceding. Humanity's priest is Christ, and more than priest. Priest, Altar, Sacrifice, Temple and Shrine in one is He. He is the Victim with blood of atoning power. By the yielding up of His life, the faithful worshipper finds his own forfeited life restored, and now he can come to God on freest terms, heart responding to heart, and life reciprocating life. The elsewhere inappassible craving of the soul for release from guilt upon real grounds, *i. e.*, on ultimate grounds of justice, in Christ is fully satisfied. That union, which is the essence, and that communion which is the expression of spiritual and eternal vitality, are in Him attained unto. And, in this view, what a force for mind and heart have a thousand allusions of the New Testament, both from the Christ Himself and from His apostles. How glows the argument in that great letter to the Hebrews, wherein is set forth the true, the more excellent, the supreme priesthood of Jesus.

In Jesus Christ we learn the essence of worship because in Him is to be learned the essence of sacrifice which must ever be viewed as the essential thing in worship. And what is the essence of sacrifice? By faith, recognized as an objective thing, it is plainly that wonder of wonders, the yielding up of Himself on the part of the holy God in behalf of the sinner, helpless in sin; and subjectively it is similar. Looking Godward, it is, on the part of the worshipper, the supreme yielding up of himself in love and trust to his Maker, even as he perceives by faith that the Maker, in infinite love, has yielded up Himself for the sake of him the creature: and looking from man to man

clearly the same idea is involved. For the sacrifice of Christ bridges over not only the awful chasm between man and his Maker, but it spans, also, the dark gulf between man and his neighbor. Religion is a binding together, whether the etymology of the word bears that idea out or not. Priesthood, therefore, it is to be concluded, taking all that is embraced in it,—religion, Christ-ianity,—is union. It is life for life and life to life, and here in a world where sin reigns, whose wages is death, it is also necessarily life from death. It is, in short first of all, love begetting love, and then it is love awakened and in confidence responding to love, and, through this love, obedience as pure and as rhythmical as the songs of the angels.

Perhaps, what is thus offered may quite satisfactorily and effectually serve to prepare the way for the third and final question here, which, indeed, is the one great question throughout, namely, In what way are all believers Priests?

I. And first, be it said that the believer to-day, or the Christian, is a priest—and every Christian is such—not tropically or by metonymy merely, but in a very real and full or exceedingly rich sense of the term. God's ideal, so to say, was that the ancient covenant people should be a priestly people, a kingdom of priests, but it remained an ideal, to be realized, as so much else in connection with the seed of Abraham was, only when the fulness of time should come. Israel was by no means ready yet for direct universal priestly approach to God in every home and by every heart. In truth, very shortly after the revelation of the divine thought in this matter concerning that people was made, they expressly declined the high position offered them, shrinking with dread from immediate intercourse with Jehovah, desiring much rather to approach Him afar off and through Moses. To-day, however, every true follower of God, in Christ is more abundantly and even literally a priest, than ever Aaron was of old, or, be it said, than ever was Melchizedec.

II. The Christian is a priest derivatively, but none the less veritably, and most exalted in every view is the position he thus

occupies. Believers are kings through Christ the King, as they are priests through Him the only cleansing priest. The double reference noted gives double assurance in the interpretation. No dignity on earth surpasses the priestly. A conception to this effect prevails among men and Scripture well bears it out. The peculiar glory of the Redeemer, as He Himself affirms, is that He came "not to be ministered unto but to minister," which ministry was accomplished under His threefold office of prophet, priest and king, wherein is to be included all that Jesus was and became and is, as well as all that He said and did and suffered. But the peculiar essence of what the Christ is, and of what He wrought, is expressed when He is called the great High Priest. So presented He is seen in the grandest single view that is to be taken of Him. His peculiar glory is apparent the moment He is regarded as the One who came "to minister and to give his life a ransom for many." And in a certain rich sense, all that Jesus was His people are through Him. He was a Son and they are sons. He became like them that they might become like Him. He is a prophet and they are prophets. So John in his first epistle (2: 27) intimates when he says, "Ye need not that any man teach you," and affirms that by a divine chrism Christians have attained unto prophethood. Abiding in Christ, the Truth, they have the truth; in the Teacher they are teachers. And like their Lord they are kings. Victory is theirs through faith in Him. They are conquerors. Themselves and the world they are to subdue to His sway, bringing every thought into subjection to Him. Just so, through the great High Priest, are Christians priests, and in this the height of their position is attained. They are priests to fill their lives with priestly work in and for Jesus, offering spiritual sacrifices, making themselves and all around them worshipful. The glory of all ancient priesthoods, among God's people culminates in the priesthood of Christ; but He is "a priest forever," and in Him that glory glows increasingly ever in the multiplying hosts of His people, to shine forth and irradiate more and more all the ages to come.

III. In this a point is reached where a final statement is possible of what is to be conceived as the very essence of the Christian Priesthood. Worship, in every age, may be assumed as substantially the same. Religion stands in three terms: God, Man, and the Mediator between them. Mediation, whatever it may be within, has its outworking in three lines—the prophetic, the priestly, and the kingly. The priestly part of mediation, the mainly essential or foundational part, has its chief outworking in the line of sacrifice. And what, again, is sacrifice? It has been declared a love-prompted yielding up in behalf of others. So God sacrificed himself in his Son; moved by love he yielded him up for man's sake. "God so loved the world." Thus God, through love, through sacrifice, through priesthood, through mediation, bridged the chasm between Himself, the Pure, and Man, by reason of sin the Impure. But as God thus comes to man, so through mediation, priesthood, sacrifice, love, must man go to God. And never, in any age, has there been any other way of getting to Him. God coming to us, sacrificing his Son, showing his love—exhibiting his truth and applying, it by his Spirit—moves us to repentance, faith, and love, and all that love includes. For we love him because he first loved us. All worship in every age is sacrifice. Its outward ground is a Sacrifice made in pure grace, or rendered freely, and its inward spirit is a sacrifice, also rendered freely: with faith as the nexus between the two. It is a love-prompted yielding up. Self-denial, the prime principle of discipleship under Jesus, must have been the prime thing in all true walking with God away back to Enoch and Abel. The true Christian, then, through God coming to him in grace in Christ and accepted of him by faith, is all that Christ is and has all that Christ bestows. He has mediation. He is a true prophet, a true king and a true priest. In Christ he has an acceptable sacrifice to offer; and Christ has inspired in him the principle of all sacrifice, even love. And with what shall man come to God, if not with that, as the prophet Micah intimates? This to repeat, is the condensed thought; Christ, God's sacrifice, the offering of his love is certainly the

objective ground of our religion. But subjectively by the soul's sacrifice of itself to God—giving up its own righteousness for the divine righteousness, its own hope for Christ formed within the hope of glory, its own life that it may have its Lord's life; by yielding up, that is, its love not as of its ownself but as something to which it is constrained by Christ—so that soul gets personally near to God. Through love thus begotten within, the essence of all sacrifice, all priesthood, all mediation, is attained, and now and thus hence, the Christian priest finds every barrier gone, no temple-courts or interceding human priests henceforth, but he for himself has now unrestricted access to the Holiest of All. This, so far as the self or personal side of the Christian Priesthood is concerned.

IV. And as to the exercise of his priestly functions in behalf of others the same profound principles apply. The great work of the Christian Priesthood is to manifest God—"to show forth (1 Pet. v. 7,) the praises of him who hath called [them] out of darkness into his marvellous light." The thought would seem to be that now, through their love begotten in Christ, their sacrifice or self-denial, through their priesthood and mediation (as above), through Christ, as it were incarnated in them—the great Prophet, Priest, and King in *them* thus prophets, priests, and kings through him—the way may thus be shown, they being living epistles of Christ, how all both Jew and Greek, Barbarian, Seythian, bond and free, may gain unhindered access to the Maker. And certainly nothing can be so to the glory of God as this. But thus, in every age, human priesthood, when true, has been the same essentially. Before the great High Priest came, his types revealed him. And this is to be remarked that the more fully they were types, *i. e.* the more clearly they revealed him, then more were they than priests in the mere Judaic order, or what may be called the scheme of theocratic particularism, employed in the unfolding of the Christ-idea, in the history of that people; they were at the same time kings and prophets, also. That is the better type of Christ was not Aaron but Melchizedec, the patriarchal priest. Even Moses, in some

ways, was a better type, who while a prophet, a law-giver, was also a ruler; and so David also—marked personal prefiguration of the coming Messiah—was more than king; he certainly exercised prophetic, if not priestly functions. In Christ, one is enabled to look back over and beyond the particularistic Judæan development of redemptive truth and to catch a glimpse of what may be called the broader, more catholic or universal thought of God. The father in every household, in pre-Judaic times, was, under divine appointment, the mediator for those dependent on him. The Church was the household and the household was the Church. The family was the state, the state the family. The unit of society was not the individual, but the home circle. No man stood alone; he was never counted except as counted in with others. And thus access was gotten to God. Trace by means of comparative theology the idea of worship back toward the dawn of race-life in Egypt, in Assyria, in Persia and India, and you invariably come to the patriarchal idea. The Vedic prayers and hymns all show that for centuries there must have been the utmost simplicity of worship. There is no thought in them of a priestly caste. Now in the Christ there is clearly a reaching back to that early time—as much a God's time as any other—to the Melchizedec or patriarchal age, when in every home was a prophet, priest and king. Jesus came to restore the law. And thus in its fulness one sees what the latter-age priesthood is. It is the planting again of the very root of the only true society life—the binding and indissoluble union of the home to God, to cure, as alone this can, the accursed jar and snarling of modern individualism run mad. It is the embodiment and expression of the whole mediatorial idea: it is more—it is the warm incarnation of the truth of mediation. It is every soul standing in union with other plainly related souls, bound to them mutually and with them bound to God. And this is the church in its ideal—not a gathering of individuals, but a gathering of households—souls responsible to souls and responsible for souls, no life apart, but where every Chris-

tian, in this way or that, by his conduct and principles, by his words and deeds and influences shall show that there is verily a highway open from sin to holiness, from earth to heaven—from man to man and from man to God—so that in all the ends of the earth it may be proclaimed and to every people, that now assuredly God “is not far from every one of us,” and that “he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him.”

February 18th, 1888.

V.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM IN ITS THEOLOGICAL BEARINGS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE PENTATEUCH QUESTION.*

BY REV. WILLIAM RUPP, D.D.

UNTIL a comparatively recent period Biblical criticism was concerned mainly with the form of the sacred text, and but little with questions concerning the genuineness, integrity and credibility of Biblical books. All questions of this kind were supposed to have been closed by the adoption of the canon. Freer and more critical views, indeed, prevailed in the age of the Reformation, when Luther, for example, denied the Johannean origin of the Apocalypse, and the Solomonic origin of the book of Ecclesiastes, and Calvin doubted the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the genuineness of the Second Epistle of Peter. But in subsequent times it was generally assumed, without any investigation or question, that the sacred writings contained in the accepted canon of Scripture were produced by the men to whom tradition had ascribed them, and at the dates which tradition had fixed.

And these writings, though produced through human instrumentality, were yet supposed to owe their existence entirely to a divine or supernatural origin. They were written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, which was believed to have preserved them absolutely free from error, and to have made them infallible in every statement and word. If even the words were

* This article forms the last of a series of papers on the general subject of "Leading Theological Problems of the Day in Relation to the Faith," read at the Mercersburg "Retreat," in the month of August, 1887.

not supposed to have been dictated by the Holy Spirit, still the minds of the writers were believed to have been so entirely under the influence of the Spirit, that every word and every syllable which they penned were clothed with infallible divine authority, and not a letter could be changed without doing some injury to God's truth. The Bible was thus supposed to be wholly divine, both in matter and form. As it came from the hands of the original writers, there could have been in it no trace of human imperfection—no error in science or history. It was infallible in everything, including even dates and details of history, as well as minute geographical descriptions.

But after having been thus produced by miraculous divine operation, the sacred writings were then supposed to have become subject to the fate of all human things. They might be rendered imperfect by the admixture of human elements. They might be corrupted by human ignorance or carelessness. They must, from time to time, pass through the hands of fallible transcribers, and thus they might become corrupted by changes, additions or omissions. Transcribers might be careless, and might occasionally drop a word or a sentence; or they might inadvertently suffer a word or a sentence to slip into the text that did not belong to it; or, finally, they might fail to understand the sense of the text lying before them, and might presume to amend it by changes or additions of their own. Thus the text might become corrupt, and such in fact has been the case. Of this there is abundant evidence in the various readings of the different manuscripts of the New Testament, and also, though in a much less degree, in those of the Old. There is need, therefore, of a critical science to give us back the text as nearly as possible in the form in which it came from the hands of the original writers. Textual criticism, accordingly, was diligently cultivated; and by the careful study and comparison of manuscripts and citations, by grammatical and logical analysis, and by the use of all attainable evidence and means, it was sought to restore the purity of the text.

It may fairly be made a question whether this was a pro-

ceeding that was entirely consistent. Was it not as important that the sacred text should be miraculously preserved from impurity after it had once come to exist, as that it should originally have been miraculously produced? What use is there in knowing that there once was an infallible text of Scripture, if we cannot be sure that we now possess it? Certainly our critical science is not infallible—a fact of which the critics of the day are constantly reminded by their uncritical opponents; and yet it is upon this science that the form of the text now depends. Is it possible, by means of a fallible process of reasoning, to arrive at an infallible result? We seem to have the same fallacy here that lurks in the reasoning of the Roman Catholic, who, by a process of fallible argumentation, arrives at the conclusion that the church is infallible, and then persuades himself that by accepting her teaching he comes to have an infallible faith. It would seem that the theory of verbal inspiration, and of an original verbal infallibility of Scripture, would further compel the assumption of a preservation of this infallibility by means of a continuous providential miracle. However, the facts in the case have been too strong to permit the advancement of such a theory. The fact of interpolations, of omissions, and of changes in the text of Scripture has been so clearly made out, that no theory of inspiration can blind men to its existence. And hence we have textual criticism as an altogether legitimate and valuable theological science.

But in more recent times men have not been satisfied with mere criticism of the text of the Bible. Scholars have addressed themselves to the discussion and solution of higher questions, namely, questions concerning the composition, the credibility, the integrity and literary form of the Biblical writings. They have not been satisfied to follow blindly any longer the traditions of the Synagogue or of the Church in questions of this kind. They have subjected these traditions to earnest critical inquiry. They have asked, for instance, whether the Biblical writings were really composed by the men whose names they bear; and if so, whether they were original pro-

ductions or compilations. And as many of the books of the Bible bear no names at all, especially in the Old Testament, the question has been asked whether they were written by the men to whom tradition has assigned them, and at the time when these men are supposed to have flourished. And, finally, the question is asked, What credibility do these writings deserve, and how are they to be understood? Are they to be taken, without exception, as records of literal facts, or may they be supposed to contain legends, myths and other poetical features, like the sacred literatures of the nations? It is with the discussion of these and similar questions that the Higher Criticism is occupied. And these questions it seeks to settle by the application to the Bible of the general principles of historical and literary criticism.*

Out of the ordeal to which the Bible has thus been subjected in modern times, the New Testament has come forth practically whole and unharmed. The critical study of it has essentially justified the judgment which the Church has always entertained concerning it. There has, indeed, been a slight modification of views in regard to the time and manner of composition of certain books, as well as in regard to the time and circumstances of their adoption into the canon. Thus it appears probable that the Apocalypse was written, not in the time of Domitian, as was once generally believed, but in the time of Nero, and that the Gospel of John, and not the Apocalypse, forms chronologically the last book of the New Testament, having been written later than the Epistles. The view of the origin of the Synoptical Gospels now is somewhat different from that which prevailed previous to the rise of modern criticism. They are no longer regarded as entirely independent productions, each one separately dictated by the Holy Spirit, but as resting upon a common basis of tradition, and the later ones embodying the material of the earlier. Thus the Gospel of Mark is supposed to have been based upon an earlier writing of Matthew in

* For a brief but clear statement of these principles, see Prof. Briggs' *Biblical Study*, pp. 86-94.

Aramaic, the "*logia*" of Papias, and upon reminiscences of the preaching of Peter; while the present Greek Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke are both believed to have been based upon the "*logia*" of Matthew and upon the Gospel of Mark, together with some independent traditions and documents.* The adoption of some such view concerning the origin of these Gospels seems to be rendered necessary by an unprejudiced consideration of their common features. The vindication of the authenticity of the Gospel of John may be regarded as one of the most eminent achievements of modern critical science. But in general the view which the Church has always entertained in regard to the character and value of the New Testament writings has been justified as substantially correct. The New Testament has proved itself to be a genuine production of the Apostolic age, truly reflecting the Christian life and faith and teaching of that age.

But the results reached by the critical study of the Old Testament have thus far proved to be somewhat more revolutionary. The tradition concerning the origin of its various books, which the Church at first received from the later Judaism, from Philo, Josephus and the Talmud, has been considerably shaken. Moses, for example, is no longer believed to have written the book of Job; nor is Solomon any longer believed to have composed the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. The Psalms with few, if any, exceptions, have been taken from David, and their origin has been assigned to different ages of Jewish history, reaching down as late as the time of the Maccabees. The second part of our present book of Isaiah (Chaps. XL.-LXVI.), the most evangelical portion of the Old Testament, has been taken from the historical Isaiah, and adjudged to some unknown prophet living in the time of the exile, when Cyrus, the Persian conqueror, whom he points out as the liberator of the Jews, had

* The above is the view of Prof. Bernhard Weiss, who supposes that Matthew's original Aramaic *logia* were written about A.D. 67, Mark's Gospel A.D. 69, our present Greek Gospel of Matthew shortly after A.D. 70, and the Gospel of Luke not later than A.D. 80.

already made his appearance upon the scene of Asiatic history.* The composition of the book of Daniel has been denied to the Daniel of the exile, and the latter portions of it at least are supposed to have originated in the times after Alexander the Great.† The books of Kings and of Chronicles are supposed to have been written in the interest of certain political and religious tendencies, and the latter especially, by an author belonging to the priestly caste, who lived two generations after the time of Ezra, who had not a complete knowledge of the institutions and practices of early Israel, and who represents past ages in the light of the theories and practices of his own time.‡

But the greatest revolution of opinion is that which has taken place in regard to the composition of the Pentateuch; and at this moment the chief interest of the Higher Criticism centres in the discussion of the various problems connected with this book. The critical scholars of the Old Testament to-day are practically unanimous in maintaining the view that the Pentateuch, or rather the *Hexateuch*—for the book of Joshua is supposed to belong to the same work—is not the production of any single writer, but a compilation of at least four separate and independent documents, which were written by different persons in different styles, with different aims and conceptions. These documents are now usually designated respectively by the letters J (for *Jahvist*), E (*Elohists*), D (*Deuteronomist*) and P (*Priest-code*). A very few critics may be of the opinion that these four documents all originated in the Mosaic age, as the four Gospels were all composed in the age of the Apostles; but the great majority of them agree in the supposition that they date from different periods long subsequent to the time of Moses. There is more difference of opinion as to the exact order of succession, or as to the relative ages, of these documents; but the most advanced critical scholarship of the day

* Cf. Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 292-295.

† Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 410-412.

‡ See *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, by W. Robertson Smith, pp. 219, 276.

is settling down to the view or theory concerning them, which has been identified with the name of *Graf*.

According to this theory the oldest document is that of the *Jahvist*, so called because *Jahveh* is the name given in it to the Deity. This document is supposed to have been written about the close of the ninth or the beginning of the eighth century before Christ, consequently not earlier than five centuries after the time of Moses. It was mainly a narrative of events, beginning with the creation and extending to the time of the Judges, conceived in the spirit of the earlier prophets; although it contained also the Ten Commandments (but without the *reasons* now incorporated with some of them), and the small collection of laws embraced in Ex. xxi.-xxiii., and there called "the book of the covenant." To it belonged, for example, the second account of creation, the history of the fall, and the family history of Adam, Gen. ii., 4.-iv., 26. The second document is called the *Elohists*, *Pre-Elohists*, or *second Elohists*, and sometimes also *theocratic narrative*. It is supposed to have originated not long after the Jahvistic writing, and to have early been combined into one work with the latter by some compiler or editor. At all events, in the present structure of the Hexateuch these two documents are so closely united that the elements belonging to each cannot always be distinguished. To the Elohist document, however, are supposed to have belonged such sections of Genesis as the account of Abraham's migration into Egypt, the battle of the kings in the vale of Siddim, the affair of Abraham with Abimelech, and also the laws contained in the little "book of the covenant," Ex. xxxiv. The third document is *Deuteronomy*. It dates from the reign of Manasseh, or from that of Josiah, and was "the book of the law" found in the temple (2 Kings xxii., 8), which made such a powerful impression upon the young king, and became the basis of the subsequent reformation under the influence of the high priest Hilkiyah. The fourth document, finally, is the *Priest-Code*, or *priestly narrative*, sometimes also called the writing of the *first Elohists*, Elohim being the name therein given to the

Deity as far as Ex. iii. To this document belonged, for example, the first account of creation, Gen. i., the "book of the generations of Adam," Gen. v., the account of the institution of the covenants, Gen. ix. and xvii., together with some other historical sections, and also the whole body of laws now contained in the three middle books of the Pentateuch, with the exception of those already named. This document was at first believed to have been the oldest, and there is still some dispute as to the relative age of it; but by the critics of the schools of Graf, it is believed to have been composed about the time of the return from the exile, or shortly after, and to stand in close relationship to the latter or legislative part of the book of Ezekiel (chaps. xl.-xlviii.). These four documents were woven into each in the form of the Hexateuch, as we now have it, by some unknown redactor or editor in the time of the second temple. This editor seems to have chosen the Priest-Code as the basis of his work, into which he wrought the Jahvistic-Elohistic narrative and the document of the Deuteronomist, making changes here and there, and introducing some additions also of his own.*

This theory, involving the idea of the comparatively recent composition of that portion of the Bible which has heretofore been regarded as the very oldest, has the support, however startling it may appear, of the most thorough Hebrew scholars of the age. Prof. W. H. Green, of Princeton, who is one of the few competent Old Testament scholars in this country that have done battle against it, tells us in a somewhat plaintive article in the *Sunday Times*, June 18, 1887, that, as far as the essential elements of the theory are concerned, the "leading

* For information in regard to the history of critical opinion concerning the Pentateuch, the reader is referred to the exhaustive articles on "*Pentateuch-Criticism: Its History and Present State*," published in the April and July numbers of this REVIEW for 1882, by Prof. F. A. Gast, D.D. As convenient sources of information on this subject in general, attention is also called to "*The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*," and to "*The Prophets in Israel*," by Dr. W. Robertson Smith, and, on the opposite side, to "*Moses and the Prophets*," by Prof. W. H. Green, D.D.

European critics are practically unanimous" in maintaining it. All parties are agreed that the Hexateuch is a composite writing. They are agreed also in their analysis of it into its several constituent documents; and they are still further agreed in assigning to these documents substantially the same portions, and in attributing to them the same peculiarities of style and the same general characteristics, differing only as to the question whether the Levitical law was first written after the exile, or a century or two earlier. Even the venerable Delitzsch and the patriarch Kurtz, after long maintaining the traditional view, have at last declared in favor of the divisive hypothesis. True, they do not draw from it the conclusions which are drawn, for instance, by Kuenen and Wellhausen, and they may modify somewhat the opinions of other critics in regard to the date of the several documents; but they have abandoned the old position, and have practically gone over to the camp of the enemy; for, after the Mosaic authorship has been abandoned and the documentary theory accepted, the most natural supposition will be, as Prof. Green well remarks, that the documents all originated in post-Mosaic times, and a few centuries more or less will make no material difference. Prof. Green derives some comfort from the consideration that "in European institutions learning is notoriously dissociated from evangelical faith," and supposes that "it is mainly bias against the supernatural that has contributed to building up this divisive hypothesis." In these reflections he will probably be followed by few earnest students. The admission that practically all competent scholars on the continent of Europe are in favor of the new hypothesis, and the further recollection that the majority of those in Great Britain and America are of the same opinion, will go far towards disposing thoughtful persons, who are not too stiff in their own opinions or too confident of their own learning, to follow in the same train. The idea that it is our superior piety, combined with inferior learning, that is saving our orthodoxy at this point, will probably not commend itself to many modest students. These, if they are not too far ad-

vanced to think of revising their opinions, or too much afraid of the labor which this will involve, will probably prefer to try whether they cannot so adjust their theological systems to the demands of the new theory, as to save both their Christian faith and their reverence for the Bible. And they will be encouraged in this direction by the example of such eminent biblical scholars as Delitzsch and Kurtz, who are certainly, not affected by any fear of the supernatural. It will, accordingly, be our aim in the remainder of this paper, to consider the theory in its theological bearings, and to show that its results in the sphere of theological conceptions are not inconsistent with the Christian faith.

It has been suggested, indeed, that this entire theory, which involves an alteration of view not merely of the Pentateuch, but also of other portions of the Old Testament, is only a passing breeze that will soon have blown over and be forgotten. By way of comparison reference has been made to the fact that the New Testament lately passed through the same critical ordeal, and came out practically unscathed. The fact is recalled that the mythical hypothesis of Strauss concerning the origin of the Gospels, and the naturalistic theories of the New Tübingen schools concerning the history and development of the Apostolic Church, have now been generally abandoned; and that, though in some particulars our views of early Christianity may have been somewhat modified, yet our reverence for the New Testament and our confidence in it have not been diminished. So, it is said, will it likely prove to be also with this present criticism of the Old Testament. When all is over, it will leave the conceptions of the Church concerning it substantially what they have always been. In one respect this prediction will doubtless turn out to be true, namely in this, that the Church will always continue to regard the Old Testament as a part, though only a subordinate part, of her rule of religious faith and practice. In other respects the prediction may not turn out to be true. It must be remembered that the New Testament scholars in the time of Strauss were not so unanimously

in favor of the hypothesis which bears his name, as the Old Testament scholars are now in favor of this new hypothesis, which bears the name of Graf. And the fact that the Church's views of the origin of the New Testament have not been essentially changed, does not prove that there may be no change of opinion in regard to the origin of any part of the Old Testament. The Bible is not a whole in such sense that our views of the origin of one part must necessarily control our views of the origin of every other part. From the fact, for instance, that the genuineness of the Gospel of John has been maintained, it does not follow that the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch also will be maintained, any more than the genuineness of Macbeth or Hamlet implies the genuineness of Titus Andronicus.* If the correctness of the traditional views concerning the origin of the biblical writings as a whole were a necessary condition of the Christian faith, then belief in the Johannean authorship of the fourth Gospel, for example, would compel us to accept, even in spite of the clearest evidence to the contrary, the Mosaic authorship of Genesis. But this certainly is not the case. The authorship of the sacred books is a matter that must be determined in each particular case, not by assumption, but by criticism; and this may well lead to different results in regard to different books.† This, however, is no doubt true: that our reverence for the Old Testament as a collection of

* It must be remembered, however, that the question concerning the Pentateuch, according to the critics, is not a question of *genuineness* at all, for they do not admit that the writing itself claims to be from the hands of Moses.

† This question concerning the authorship of a Biblical book, has nothing to do with the question concerning its *inspiration*. The inspiration of a book is something the presence of which may be immediately felt—something that bears its witness to itself; and in order to receive this witness, it is not necessary to know first by whom the book was written. If a piece of statuary were dug up from the ruins of some ancient city, the question whether it were a piece of *true art*, would not depend upon the question by whose hands it was executed. Of its artistic character it would bear its own evidence in itself. And so an inspired book bears the evidence of its inspiration in itself, whether its author be known or not.

inspired writings, which are "profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," will not be diminished by the outcome of any critical theory. It will continue to hold its place in the Church as a book of infallible religious and moral teaching. And this will be the case with every single book contained in it. Whatever may have been the history of the origin and composition of the Pentateuch, its great value as a book of religious instruction will not be diminished.

But it is said that if the Pentateuch is not the work of Moses, then it is a *forgery*, and therefore unworthy of credit. The book itself, it is affirmed, claims to have been composed by Moses; and if this claim is false, then, it is said, the whole thing must have been an imposture. This, however, it is maintained on the other side, is not an exact representation of the case. The book, as a whole, does not claim to have been written by Moses. All that is said in the book itself is that Moses wrote, or was commanded to write, certain things; and even such statements occur only in five passages, namely, in relation to the affair with Amalek (Ex. xvii. 14), the laws of the book of the Covenant (Ex. xxiv. 4 and xxxiv. 27), the list of stations in the wilderness (Num. xxxiii. 2), and certain laws and the song in Deuteronomy (xxxi. 9, 22, 24). These statements certainly would seem to prove nothing concerning the composition of the book as a whole in its present form; as if they prove anything at all, they prove just the opposite of what they have been claimed to prove. If it were said, in a history of the United States, that Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, no one would infer from this that he was the author also of that history. The only thing that follows from these statements is that the original composition of certain documents and laws was in later time attributed to Moses. And this is a fact which, for the times after the exile when the Pentateuch is supposed by the critics to have received its present form, cannot be denied, and which will receive attention farther on. At present we merely observe that, judging in the light of the principles

which govern modern literary habits, there is no room for the charge of forgery in the case of the Pentateuch as a whole, for it does not profess to be the work of Moses, but at most only for the charge of misunderstanding or of misrepresentation in regard to those few sections or documents whose original composition is in the work itself attributed to Moses.

But a more general reply to the charge of forgery is that the very idea in this case involves an *anachronism*. There can be no idea of stealing so long as men have not learned to distinguish the rights of property; and so there can be no idea of forgery so long as there is no notion of literary ownership. If in our day an author were to palm off his own productions in the name of another, that would be dishonorable, and would subject the offender to moral censure. But, it is affirmed, this was not at all the case in ancient Israel, or in antiquity generally. There were then no such ideas of literary propriety. An ancient writer knew nothing of quotation marks. The historian simply copied the statements of his predecessors, and added his own observations, without giving the reader any clew as to what was his own and what was borrowed, except that which he might get from the difference of language and style. It never occurred to the mind of writer or reader that this was a matter of any consequence.* And as it was not supposed that there was anything dishonorable in appropriating the language of another without giving credit, so it was not supposed that there was anything dishonorable in putting one's own language into the mouth of another without proclaiming the fact. This is what the poet does still. And the writers of antiquity in this respect were all poets. Thus we know that Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon are constantly in the habit of putting speeches into the mouths of historical personages that were never spoken. That the same habit also prevailed among Hebrew writers may be learned from a comparison of the speeches and documents reported in the books of Kings and Chronicles.

* For an account of the method of ancient oriental historians see *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 325.

In these there often are, not only differences in detail, but clear proofs also in the language and style that they are the writer's own composition. See, for example, 1 Chron. xxix. 10-20, and compare 2 Chron. ii. 3-6 with 1 Kings v. 3-9. A later writer, then, would have thought no harm at all in putting his own words into the mouth of Moses by means of such formulas as constantly recur in the Levitical and Deuteronomic codes: "The Lord spake unto Moses," or "The Lord commanded Moses to write," and "Moses wrote." This might be done with a view of giving greater weight to the things that were written, especially if the writer was merely reducing to a written form customs and traditions that were derived from the past; but it was never done in order to deceive. It was merely following a literary custom, that was well understood, that deceived nobody, and that at the time was rather considered praiseworthy than otherwise. Only in later ages, when this early literary habit was no longer understood, did the fact become misleading.

But is not the denial of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch an impeachment of the veracity of Christ and of the Apostles? Christ speaks of various laws which are contained in the Pentateuch as "laws of Moses;" and he also speaks of the "Books of Moses." Sometimes even He uses the name of Moses as a designation for a certain portion of the Old Testament Scriptures. The Apostles also in many passages use similar language. This fact is held by some to settle the question, and to make all further evidence inadmissible. But to this it may be replied, on the other hand, that Christ, during the days of His flesh was not and did not claim to be omniscient. However we may explain it, whether on the supposition of a *kenosis* of the divine attributes, or on the principle of a *progressive* union of the divine and human in His person—the fact remains. There were no doubt many things in regard to which He never exercised His mind, and on which therefore He had no opinion. In such matters he simply conformed to the opinions and ideas of His age. And this He may have done in some cases even when He knew that these opinions and ideas were not strictly

correct. He may have acted in many things on the principle of accommodation. It was not His mission to impart infallible information on all possible subjects. The great object of His mission was to establish the kingdom of God; and to this end it was not necessary to interfere with current opinions, whether physical or theological, unless they were in direct conflict with the essence of that kingdom. When Jesus, therefore, speaks of the sun as rising and setting, He simply speaks the language of His time, and does not at all bind us to the Ptolemaic theory of the heavens. When He speaks of a grain of mustard seed as the "smallest of all seeds," He does not lend His infallible authority to a botanical statement, and we are not therefore bound to hold that there can be no smaller seeds. And so, when he speaks of the "Book of Moses," and of the "law of Moses," He simply accommodates Himself to the current opinion of His time, but does not forever bind the church to that opinion. It was not His business to set the Jews straight on matters of science, or history, or criticism, even if He knew that they were in error. These were matters that would right themselves in course of time. There were truths which even the disciples could not then bear; and these were left to be learned gradually from the illumination of the Holy Spirit in subsequent times. But the Jews in the days of Christ would certainly not have borne it if they had been told that Moses did not write their law. If the question involved had been one of morality or religion, it would have been necessary to correct them at all hazards; but as it was not that, it might well be left to the decision of time. The authority of Christ, then, does not decide the question. In fact the pretended authority of Christ in this case becomes simply the authority of that generation of the Jews which crucified Christ. That the Jews of that day believed that Moses had written the Pentateuch, and a good deal more besides, there is no doubt; but certainly we are not bound to follow their example.

But if we accept the documentary hypothesis, and suppose that the different documents of which the Pentateuch consists

were written at different periods long subsequent to the time of Moses, what becomes of its credibility? What is a history worth that was written five or six hundred years after the time which it professes to describe? "What," says Prof. Green, "would be thought of the credibility of the Gospels, if they were not written for six or ten centuries after Christ?" Can we rely upon the Pentateuch as giving us correct information concerning the early religious history of Israel and the primitive condition of mankind if we accept this critical theory of its origin? Now if we were to adopt the theory of verbal inspiration, or any theory involving the idea of a direct, miraculous impartation of knowledge to a sacred writer, we might answer that the question as to the time and place of the composition of an inspired document cannot affect its credibility. It would have been as easy for God miraculously to communicate the history of the Mosaic age to an author living six hundred or a thousand years later, as it would be for Him to impart to Moses the history of the two or three thousand years preceding his own time. There we have the same difficulty, and might ask the same question. What is the historical value of the book of Genesis on the traditional theory? For according to this theory it was not composed until some thousands of years after the events which it professes to record. Or rejecting the theory of verbal inspiration, and of a miraculous impartation of knowledge, then the question may be asked: supposing Moses to have written the Pentateuch, how did he get his knowledge of the times preceding his own age? Was he dependent upon oral tradition, or did he have earlier written documents to make use of? Probably most of the defenders of the old view would now answer that for the history of the times preceding his own age Moses used written documents. That earlier documents were used in the composition of Genesis is apparent from the peculiar use of the divine names *Elohim* and *Jehovah** in different sections, and

* This alternation of divine names throughout Genesis is a phenomenon that has long attracted attention. But it was usually explained as expressing a subtle distinction of thought in the mind of the same writer. Thus

also from certain duplicate accounts of the same occurrence as is strikingly the case in the record of the flood. But this is admitting too much for the old theory; for sections or portions of these documents incorporated in Genesis, marked by the same peculiarities of thought and diction, are found all the way through to the end of Joshua, thus proving that they belonged to an age long posterior to the time of Moses. The admission of documents in Genesis is in fact a death-blow to the hypothesis of its Mosaic origin.

The admission of the composite structure of the Pentateuch, however, and of the separate origin of its constituent parts, in times remote from each other, does not render it valueless as a source of information concerning the early history of Israel. The general course and character of the history of Israel, at least after the settlement of the nation in Canaan, are known from other sources, namely, from the historical books of Judges, Samuel and Kings, and from the writings of the early prophets. The calling of the nation from Egypt, the sojourn in the wilderness, the conquest of Canaan, the religious constitution, and the peculiar character of the people as the people of Jahveh, these are matters which are sufficiently known from the sources just referred to. And the prejudice that, as the Pentateuch relates events which were prior in time to that of some of the prophets, it must, therefore, be an older production than the writings of the prophets, might have been corrected by reflecting that the Gospels also were not the first but the last part of the New Testament to be committed to writing. It is needless to say that the history contained in the Pentateuch is not in conflict with what we otherwise know of the character and call-

Elohim was supposed to designate God in His universal relation to the world, while *Jehovah* (or *Jahveh*, as the word is now believed to have been pronounced) was supposed to designate Him in His theocratic relation as the covenant God of Israel. This explanation is still contained in Lange's Commentary on Genesis. But on this supposition, it is strange to say the least, that *Elohim* and not *Jehovah* should be used precisely in those sections which record the institution of the covenants, like Gen. ix. 1-17, and especially Gen. xvii.

ing of Israel. It is even contended that the picture of Israel portrayed in the Pentateuch is more easily identified with the picture contained in the historical books, on the ground of the critical theory of the origin of the Pentateuch, with its view of different codes of law published at different times, than on the ground of the traditional theory.

But even of the earlier times, back to the age of Moses, and beyond, the Pentateuch does not, in consequence of the critical theory of its composition, cease to be an important historical witness. Even if the several documents preserved in it were nothing more than the gathering up of traditions floating in the national mind and memory, they would still be valuable sources of information. It must be remembered that in early ages and in the East, tradition was much more stiff and unchangeable than it is now among Western peoples, and therefore a much more faithful reflection of by-gone times and events. Men then lived slowly, and they lived long. Their lives were not hurried, and their minds were not distracted by many conflicting thoughts. They had no journals and read no books. The few events which then made any impression upon the human mind made a strong and lasting impression; and the stories of these impressions were repeated in the same form of words and handed down from generation to generation with few, if any, important modifications; so that, if there were any errors contained in these stories, they were as likely to have been due to an original faulty impression as to any defect in the method of their perpetuation. The Israelites had no mythology in the strict sense of the term. Max Muller, who maintains that mythology is mainly a "disease of language," holds that the absence of it from the literature of Israel is due principally to the character of their language, which in nearly all cases preserves the appellative or predicative power of its roots, thus making its words so transparent in meaning that they would serve as a barrier to the development of the mythological instinct.* Perhaps some doubt might be awakened in regard to this position

* Chips from a German Workshop, Vol. 1, Art. *Semitic Monotheism*.

by the fact that, among other Semitic nations which spoke kindred tongues, the mythological instinct was developed with sufficient luxuriance. But however it may be accounted for, the fact remains that the Hebrew mind did not produce anything like a mythology equalling that of the Hindoos or Greeks. Some events in the national and patriarchal history, indeed, might be clothed in a symbolical or poetical garb, and others might in the course of time acquire something of a legendary character; so that we should not be justified in taking for literal history such narratives as that concerning the standing still of the sun and moon in the time of Joshua, or the floating of the axe-head in the time of Elisha. If the statement that "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera," or that, at the time of the exodus, "the mountains skipped like rams," must be regarded as poetry, what is to hinder us from regarding it as poetry also, when we are told that the waters were a wall unto them on the right hand and on the left when Israel passed through the Red Sea, or that the waters of the Jordan "stood and rose up in one heap," when they crossed over into Canaan? But, while the Hebrew mind was not preserved from poetical and idealizing tendencies, it was at least preserved from that rank growth of mythology which involves truth and fiction in inextricable confusion. And this tendency of mind would display itself in the formation and maintenance of popular traditions no less than in writing. In such tradition the recollection of historical events, such as made a deep impression upon the national mind, might be preserved for ages with tolerable accuracy; and a writer living even six or eight hundred years after the age of Moses might be able to give a fair historical account of it.*

* It must be admitted, indeed, that on this theory we can no longer have that assurance of the absolute correctness of historical statements, in all their details, which was once supposed to be guaranteed by the theory that everything in the Bible was either written by infallible eye-witnesses or by men who had been miraculously gifted with infallible knowledge of everything. But what religious end would such assurance serve? Is it necessary for

If, however, the new hypothesis concerning the composition of the Pentateuch, with its notion of several independent and divergent codes of law, be accepted, it will compel us to reconstruct, in some important respects, our traditional views of the course of religious life and thought in Israel. Hitherto the people of Israel have been believed to have received their religious as well as political ideas and institutions, all finished and complete, at the hands of Moses, at the very beginning of their national existence. In this respect there was no possibility of development or progress in after ages. Their theology and ritual were complete from the first. They received, under the shadow of Horeb and in the plains of Moab, a complete system of laws regulating the minutest details of social, civil and religious life—a system of laws that could neither be changed nor amended; although some of them did not, and in the nature of the case, could not come into general application until centuries later. There is no similar phenomenon in all the history of all the world besides. The case finds no parallel in anything that we read of other ancient law-givers. This, of course, is acknowledged by the advocates of the traditional view, and explained by pointing to the supernatural origin of the Mosaic legislation. But there is observed a vast and far-reaching discrepancy between the legislation of the Pentateuch and the actual religious life of Israel, as we know it from the earlier historical books and from the writings of the earlier prophets. For ages the religious life of Israel was not conformed either to the Deuteronomic or the Levitical code. This disagreement between the actual history of Israel and the legislation as it now stands in the Pentateuch, has generally been set down to the account of apostasy. The life of Israel for a thousand

our salvation to know infallibly how Israel got out of Egypt, how many fighting men there were among them, how Jericho was taken, how many battles David fought, how many enemies one or another of his captains slew, how long this or that king reigned? These certainly are not matters pertaining to the essence of religion, and we lose nothing if, in regard to these and similar things, we are bound to be satisfied with something less than absolute certainty of knowledge.

*

years must, on this view, be supposed to have been a continuous open violation of laws once promulgated under the most awful and solemn outward circumstances. And the best men as well as the worst, prophets and seers, kings and judges, were alike transgressors. It is not until after the time of Ezra, when Israel had ceased to be an independent nation, that we see these laws completely enforced. There was a short golden age, when Israel wandered in the wilderness, a brief period of splendid manifestations of miraculous power on the one hand, and of religious fervor and devotion on the other; and then there came a long, dark age of a thousand years, during which the law was either forgotten or trampled under foot. And the earlier parts of this age, so far as fidelity to the Levitical law is concerned, were by far the worst. Immediately after the death of Moses and Joshua, the people sank at once from their high position to the low level of apostasy, from which they were partially raised in the time of David and Solomon, and again in that of Josiah, but not completely and permanently until the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Such has been the traditional view.

Now if the present critical hypothesis be accepted, this view *need* not, and *can* not be held any longer. On the contrary it will not only be possible, but necessary, to recognize in the history of Israel a process of development, involving all religious ideas, laws and institutions, in a manner corresponding to the universal laws of human progress. The three strata of laws contained in the Pentateuch—namely, “the book of the covenant,” and the Deuteronomic and Levitical codes—will then mark the three stages of religious development, which are reflected successively in the historical books. This view may be illustrated by means of an example or two. Take, for instance, the case of the sanctuary and of the priesthood. The books of Judges and of Samuel, and the writings of the earlier prophets, Amos, Hosea and Isaiah, describe a religious community in which there is no recognized central sanctuary and no exclusive priesthood. Jehovah is worshipped

at a number of local sanctuaries, or *high places*, where the best men, like Gideon, Jephthah, Samuel and Elijah, present sacrifices.* The Levites, indeed, seem to have enjoyed some pre-eminence as priests, as we learn from Judges xviii. 13; but the priesthood was not confined to any particular tribe or family. Samuel, though he constantly performed priestly functions, was an Ephraimite. The sons of David were priests, *kohanim* (2 Sam. viii. 18); and both David and Solomon had court-priests who were not of Levitical descent (2 Sam. xx. 26; 1 Kings iv. 5). King Solomon also himself, three times a year, offered burnt offerings and peace offerings upon the altar at Jerusalem (1 Kings ix. 25). All this is not in agreement with the Deuteronomic or Levitical law. It is in harmony, however, with the laws of the "book of the covenant," or first code, which allows the erection of altars anywhere, and gives directions for their construction (Ex. xx. 24-26); and which knows nothing of any exclusive priesthood. The inference is that these were the only laws known in Israel during the time in which this state of things prevailed. From the time of Solomon onward there was a struggle between the temple at Jerusalem and the ancient local sanctuaries, which, in consequence of the frequent prostitution of these latter to the service of idolatry, as the critics hold, resulted at last, in the times of Josiah, in the victory of the former and the suppression of the

*Prof. Green holds that the *place of the ark* was the only place where sacrifices could be lawfully offered; and that after the fall of the priests of Shiloh and the capture of the ark in the first battle of Eben-Ezer, there really was no legal sanctuary, and good men like Samuel might worship in local high places rather than not worship at all. See *Moses and the prophets*, pp. 139-169. But the captivity of the ark lasted only seven months, when it was returned to Israel by the Philistines, and the legitimate sanctuary might have been restored. Why was this not done? Prof. Green says that it was because God, having in the event of the battle abandoned Shiloh, had given no intimation that He had chosen any other place. One dislikes to differ from so high an authority, but the question forces itself upon us: How does the Professor know this? The critics are generally blamed for dealing too much in *suppositions*. But, perhaps, they are not the only sinners who are guilty of this crime.

latter. During this period also the priesthood came to be confined to the tribe of Levi, but not yet to the family of Aaron. This is the religious polity described in the book of Deuteronomy. This book no longer permits the free erection of altars, which is expressly sanctioned in the first code. The unity of the sanctuary is strictly enforced, and no sacrifices are allowed to be valid that are offered anywhere else than at the central altar. But the Deuteronomic code, as yet, knows nothing of the Aaronic priesthood. According to repeated statements made in the book *all the Levites are priests*. Compare, for instance, Deut. xxiii. 1, and xxiv. 8; and also Josh. iii. 3. The books of Kings are written from this standpoint, except where older documents are quoted, as is the case, for instance, in the history of the northern prophets, Elijah and Elisha, and reflect the religious conceptions of Deuteronomy. In the Levitical code, finally, the unity of the sanctuary is presupposed and no other priests are recognized than the sons of Aaron. So jealously, indeed, are the rights of their priesthood here guarded, that any attempt at infringement is to be punished with death. But this state of things is not fully realized until the time of the second temple. It is from this standpoint, however, that the books of Chronicles are written, and the author, at times, even bends the facts of early history so as to make them square with his theory.

These examples prove that the religious institutions of Israel were not in all respects the same from the beginning, but that there was change and development, or *evolution*, here as elsewhere in the world, and that the assumptions of the critical theory fit into the facts of the history. The same thing could be shown by reference to other parts of the religious constitution. For example, the feast of tabernacles was not observed according to the Levitical law until after the time of the exile, as we learn from Nehemiah viii. 17. So also the author of the books of Kings informs us (2 Kings xxiii. 22) that the passover was not observed according to the provisions of the recently dis-

covered book of the law previous to the time of Josiah.* The day of atonement again is not heard of in the actual history of Israel until we come to the prophecy of Ezekiel. Other facts also, relating to the ceremony of worship, could be mentioned to the same effect. But while there were changes in the external ritual of worship, there was development also in the sphere of internal religious ideas and sentiments. The ideas of God and of divine worship, as well as the practice of worship, became more refined and spiritual as time went on. And this spiritualization of faith and worship was the consequence, in part at least, of the unification of the sanctuary, and the consequent restriction of animal sacrifices, as ordained in the Deuteronomic and Levitical law. The early Israelite, as he is known, not from the Pentateuch, but from the oldest historic books, had no conception of Divine worship simply as an act or service of the heart expressed in prayer and praise. To build an altar, in case none existed, and to offer a burnt offering, was an indispensable part of homage to his God. Without this he would not have felt that he had worshipped. And this feeling was recognized in the first code, as we have already seen, by the unlimited permission given for the erection of altars anywhere in the land (Ex. xx. 24).† This is the state of things that we find prevailing in the time of the Judges and of Samuel, and even later in the time of the Kings, in which the best men, in moments of profound religious emotion, build altars and offer sacrifices. But this practice became impossible after the legal prohibition of local sanctuaries, and the restriction of

* These statements do not imply that festivals were not celebrated from early times corresponding to the later feasts of tabernacles and the pass-over, for an autumn festival and the feast of unleavened bread in the spring are mentioned in the first code. But the meaning is that these festivals were not anciently celebrated *according to the provisions of the law existing in later times.*

† The argument that this permission applied only to the times of the sojourning in the wilderness seems to be mere quibbling, for the laws of the entire collection in which this is embodied, are plainly not laws intended for mere wandering nomades, but for a settled agricultural people.

sacrificial offerings to the temple at Jerusalem. Then the people who lived in remote parts of the country, or in foreign lands, could either not worship at all, or they must learn to worship in some more refined and spiritual way. And they did learn to worship in a freer way. Under the influence of the teaching of the prophets, who laid more stress on purity of heart and on righteous conduct than on the slaying of sacrifices, the Jews, in the time especially of the second temple, after the experiences of the Babylonian captivity, learned to worship Jehovah in a more rational and spiritual manner than their fathers had known. It was during this time that the synagogue arose, where no sacrifices were offered at all, but where the service consisted exclusively of rational and spiritual exercises. And, as is well known, it was not the Temple, but the Synagogue that furnished the type of worship for the early Christian Church.

On the view here supposed the legislation now contained in the Pentateuch is the result of a *gradual growth*. This view assimilates the origin of the law of Israel *formally* to the origin of legal systems among other nations. Customs grow up slowly, and acquire the force of law. Sentiments are formed gradually, and become legal principles or precepts. The decision of judges, given in the gates of the city or in the forum, become precedents. From time to time, also, as a nation advances in civilization, there arise legislative enactments or statutes. From these various sources grows, in process of time, the body of a nation's laws. And essentially in this way the law of Israel is supposed to have originated. The several codes now preserved in the Pentateuch were not pure inventions or original productions, at the time of their first publication; for if they had been, they would never have found acceptance with the people; but they were digests of legal maxims and rules which had gradually gained currency, and which might originally have grown out of the force of example or custom, or out of the decisions of judges and priests, or out of the utterances and commandments of prophets and kings. There seems to be a

reminiscence of this manner of law-production still preserved in one of the oldest portions of the Pentateuch itself (Ex. xviii. 16), where Moses is represented as a judge who in the decision of cases between man and man, causes the people to know the statutes of God and His laws; and a still more striking one in Ezra (ix. 11), where laws now contained in the Pentateuch are said to have been given by the hands of God's *servants, the prophets*. It is not denied, of course, that Moses was a legislator, and that the fundamental principles of the constitution of Israel were derived from him. He was, in this sense the originator of Israel's law. Indeed, this seems to be presupposed by the fact that the later collectors of laws found it expedient to put these laws into his mouth. Had Moses not passed for the author of the fundamental law of Israel, it is not likely that there would have been any thought of investing institutions and ordinances of later growth with the authority of his name. It need not be supposed that this was ever done with a view to deceive. In some cases, perhaps in most, it may have been the simple belief of the compilers of these laws themselves. What more natural than that institutions which had grown up spontaneously, and of whose origin no one remembered anything, should be attributed to Moses, the great deliverer of Israel from Egypt, and the founder of the Israelitish nationality? Thus we know that the Jews of later times attributed everything of which they no longer knew the beginning to Ezra. And even when this was done with the consciousness that the facts were otherwise, it was in harmony with the common literary habit of the time, and therefore deceived no one.

But if this view of the origin of Israel's law be correct, then it may be asked, what becomes of the assertions so often made in the Pentateuch, that the laws and ordinances there contained are revelations of Jehovah? This we believe to be the vital question in the whole matter under discussion; and if this can be satisfactorily answered, there remains no other that need seriously disturb any Christian mind. It is often said in the Pentateuch that Jehovah spake unto Moses, or unto Moses

and Aaron, and that He communicated to them certain laws. How are we to understand this? On the theory here under consideration we can, of course, not understand it in the literal sense which such language now conveys to us. Nor is it at all likely that it was intended to be understood in this sense by those who first used it. They did not mean to convey the idea that Jehovah's voice was heard sounding from the sky, or that His words were impressed upon the natural ear by means of atmospheric vibrations. Nor need they be supposed to have meant to convey the idea that these laws were communicated to the mind of the law-giver in a manner superseding the ordinary laws and operations of human consciousness. Men in those early times felt themselves to be living in closer communion with the Deity than we do. Thoughts which were suggested to them by casual circumstances, or which came to them without any conscious effort of reflection, and purposes arising out of such thoughts, they attributed to a direct Divine origin. They said: "Jehovah said these things to me," or, "These are the words of Jehovah." Thus Jeremiah, when his uncle's son suggested to him the redemption of a field to which he had the right of inheritance, recognized in this the voice of Deity, saying, "Then I knew that this was the word of Jehovah" (Jer. xxxii. 8). So David, when he was asked to consent to the punishment of the insulting Shimei, refused, saying "Jehovah hath said unto him, Curse David" (2 Sam. xvi. 10). And this was a peculiarity of thought that belonged not only to the Israelites, but also to their heathen neighbors of the same race. Thus Rabshakeh said to the messenger of Hezekiah; "Jehovah said unto me, Go up against this land, and destroy it" (2 Kings xviii. 25). And in the inscription of the Moabite Stone, Mesha, King of Moab says: "Chemosh said to me, Go, take Nebo of Israel;" and again: "Chemosh said to me, Go down, fight against Horonaim." These examples show that such language is not to be taken in the literal sense which the western mind would naturally attribute to it. When we read, therefore, that Jehovah spake unto Moses, and dictated to him

certain laws, as, for instance, those in the book of Leviticus relating to the sacrificial ritual, we should not be justified on the face of it to take such statements literally.

But what has just been said may serve to put us on the right track of a correct understanding. The Israelite had a very strong consciousness of the presence and energy of God in everything. He recognized God in the phenomena of nature; and he recognized Him no less in the phenomena of mind and of history. He heard His voice in the experiences of human life; and he read His thoughts in the events and institutions of history. And was he not right in doing so? Is not God in history as well as in nature? Is he not the founder of nations and kingdoms? And is He not then, also the author of national historical institutions, although no external voice may have been heard proclaiming them from the sky? If we remember this universal Divine immanence in the world, then we can have no difficulty with these statements of Scripture now claiming our attention. Institutions that grew gradually out of the national life and consciousness of Israel, may yet be rightly referred to a Divine ordination, and such ordination may be described symbolically as *Divine speaking*. It may be objected, indeed, that this view reduces the history of Israel to a mere natural development, and makes no essential difference between it and the historical development of other nations. But to this we would reply that, if by natural development is meant a process of development from which God is excluded, and with which He has nothing to do, which is the conception that many persons have of the idea of evolution, then the objection is groundless; for God Himself is here supposed to be immanent in the process of history. And although there may be no *essential* difference between His presence and working in the history of Israel and in the history of other nations, there is, nevertheless a *great* and *important* difference.* The idea of God's immanence in

* Some may still flatter themselves that they have explained this difference when they have called the one process *supernatural* and the other *natural*. But what is the *supernatural*, and what the *natural*? From the

the world does not require us to believe that He is everywhere equally and alike present, like the force of gravitation. We believe that God was in the life of Israel in a higher and more intensive form than that in which He was present in the life of the heathen nations around them, although these also were His offspring and had their life and being in Him. This at least was the conviction of the Israelites themselves. They felt that though Jehovah was the universal God, yet they were His chosen, His peculiar people. The idea of an intenser presence and activity of God in Israel than elsewhere, may be inferred from the very fact that the religious development of Israel, which must have started on the plane of the common Semitic heathenism, grew so vastly beyond that of the surrounding nations. The same idea may also be inferred from the fact that Israel, in the fullness of time, gave birth to the world's Messiah. Jehovah lived and wrought mightily and graciously in the life of Israel before the Word was made flesh; and that was what made Israel a holy people, and their literature a sacred and inspired literature, no matter how it may have originated. The literature of Israel is the inspired record of a revelation—a revelation not, indeed, made in the way of an external impartation of words or thoughts—but a revelation,

old Deistic standpoint, which puts God outside the universe, and supposes the world ordinarily to be moving on like a machine, according to laws and forces stamped upon it at the moment of creation, this independent world-movement is the *natural*; and the occasional interposition in this movement, or interference with it, on the part of God, for the purposes of revelation or redemption, together with the result of such interferences, constitute the *supernatural*. From this standpoint the characterization of the history of Israel as supernatural, in distinction from that of other nations as merely natural, may be allowed to be very good. But from the standpoint of modern theistic thinking it is common to define the natural as the physical or impersonal, the realm of necessary causation, and the supernatural as the realm of personality and freedom. According to this distinction, man himself belongs to the order of the supernatural, and there is a supernatural element in all human history. Consequently, the application of these terms no longer suffices for the explanation of the difference between sacred and secular history.

though conditioned by outward historical events, yet made ultimately in and through the reason of man himself—that reason which is in all men a light kindled by the eternal reason or Logos, but which in Israel was fanned by the breath of the Spirit into a brighter flame than glowed anywhere else. It is this brighter glow of the Divine spark of reason in the souls of prophets and holy men of old, that gives to the literature of Israel an interest and a value above that belonging to any other ancient people.

But if the institutions of Israel thus grew spontaneously out of the national life and spirit, and can be referred to a Divine ordination only in so far as the Divine energy is immanently related to the national life, then what becomes of the value of the law as a schoolmaster to lead to Christ? And what becomes of the value of its rites and institutions as types and shadows of Christian realities? We answer that, while they can not in all respects be explained as they may once have been explained under the influence of exaggerated notions of their typical design, yet they do not lose their value in this regard in consequence of the more natural views of their origin. "The law was a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things." This is elementary Christian teaching; which, although it warns us that we must not expect to find an exact *likeness* of Christian realities in Old Testament institutions, as for instance, the likeness of the Christian atonement in the Old Testament sacrifices, yet implies that in general the ordinances of the law are pre-intimations or types of future realities. But it need not, therefore, be imagined that these ordinances must have had their origin in immediate divine commands, externally or miraculously announced; and that they must have been thus appointed with the express and acknowledged purpose of representing to the mind of believers future spiritual facts and truths. Types of future developments are not anywhere produced in that way. The cotyledons of the plant are types of the coming leaves, and the leaves are types of the approaching flower; but cotyledons and leaves are not

put upon the plant merely for the purpose of foreshadowing future things. They are produced by the inner life of the plant and serve an important purpose in its economy. Historical types are of the same character. They are the shadows which coming events cast before them. Moses was a type of Christ, but Moses was not created merely to serve this special purpose. And so it was with the sacrificial and other ceremonies of the law: they were not given to the Israelite to represent to his mind some future reality or event; but they grew out of the character and tendency of his national life and spirit, and he expressed in them his own immediate aspirations and feelings.

The idea of an *immediate* divine institution of the sacrificial ritual, for example, in the time of Moses, for the purpose of picturing to the mind of the Israelite future spiritual realities, is contradicted by several plain facts. It is contradicted, for instance, by the fact that the Levitical laws relating to sacrifice are for the most part merely *directive*, not *mandatory*. If sacrifices are to be offered, a matter which in most cases is left to men's own choice, then they are to be offered according to the directions here given; the object, it would seem, being rather to check than to stimulate the tendency to multiply such offerings. The idea of an immediate institution of sacrificial offerings by God is contradicted also by the general attitude which the prophets assume toward them. We have already referred to the fact that the prophets lay but little stress upon such offerings. Compare, for example, Isa. i., 11-14, Mic. vi., 6-8, and Jer. vi., 20-22. Amos, moreover, informs us (v. 22-26) that no sacrifices were offered to Jehovah at all during the forty years of wandering in the wilderness; and Jeremiah denies that Jehovah gave any commandment concerning such offerings at the time of the exodus (Jer. vii., 21-24). These are facts which cannot be waved aside, and which cannot be easily reconciled with the hitherto current views concerning the origin of Israel's law. Another such fact is that the same sacrificial customs which prevailed in Israel are found to have ex-

rificial customs which prevailed in Israel are found to have existed substantially also among other Semitic nations, such as the Phœnicians and Carthaginians. A Phœnician tablet found at Marseilles mentions burnt-offerings, vow-offerings, peace-offerings, meat-offerings in nearly the same terms by which they are known in the Old Testament. Now, if the Hebrews received their sacrificial system by direct divine revelation, how did the Phœnicians come to get an almost similar one? It is certainly not likely that they borrowed it from the Hebrews. It is more likely that the similarity is due to the fact that both systems grew out of a common Semitic soil, and originally expressed the spiritual aspirations and tendencies in the life of each nation. That the Hebrew system is at last found to be free from those abominations and cruelties which always deformed the Phœnician, must be attributed to that peculiar working of God in Israel of which we have already spoken.

But while the law of Israel must thus be supposed to have grown out of the soil of the national life and history, its ordinances must nevertheless be regarded as types or shadows of Christ. They were "shadows of things to come, but the body is Christ's." He is the end of the law, as He is the flower of the national life. Indeed, regarded in this way, not only single, isolated events and institutions, but the entire history of Israel becomes typical of Christ, and the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures testify of Him. This also is the view which prevails in the New Testament itself. Not a few passages merely, the so-called Messianic prophecies, but the whole law and the prophets testify of Christ. Hence St. Matthew says that the prophecy concerning the birth of the virgin's son, which was given to Ahaz as a sign of speedy deliverance from the hands of Pekah and of Rezin, kings of Ephraim and of Syria, was fulfilled in the birth of Jesus. And when the prophet says, referring to the ancient deliverance of Israel from Egypt by the power of Jehovah, "Out of Egypt have I called my son," the evangelist tells us that this was fulfilled when the holy family returned with Jesus from Egypt,

whither they had fled in order to escape the wrath of Herod. And in the fact that the bones of Jesus were not broken on the cross, St. John sees a fulfillment of one of the ceremonial directions concerning the passover, namely, that not a bone of it should be broken, and perhaps also of a statement contained in one of the Psalms, to the effect that the Lord keepeth all the bones of the righteous, so that not one of them is broken. On the old, mechanical view of Messianic types and prophecies such interpretations of New Testament occurrences as fulfillments of Old Testament Scriptures, which without these interpretations no body would have regarded as Messianic, must ever remain a riddle; while on the view of the essentially Messianic character of the whole history of Israel these interpretations of the evangelists become at once plain.

But it is time to bring this discussion to an end. We believe that it has been made to appear, notwithstanding the imperfections of our effort, of which we are fully conscious, that the Higher Criticism, no matter what revolution it may occasion in the world of traditional theological opinion, is not necessarily fatal to the Christian faith. We do not believe that the citadel of Christianity is assailed when the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is questioned, or the Davidic authorship of the Psalms. The critics, for the most part at least, are Christian men, who love the truth as sincerely as their opponents do, and are as honest and diligent in their efforts to attain it. And nothing but the attainment of the truth ought to be the desire or aim of any one. The truth can never be any thing bad. No matter what the consequences may be, they will be such as God desires. And they will not, in this case, be the subversion of the Christian faith. Christianity will survive all changes of opinion in regard to the Bible, just as it survives all revolutions of theological systems. It is not built upon the Bible, or upon any interpretation of the Bible, but upon Christ. Though the Bible will always be important as the authoritative reflection of Christianity in its early, formative period, and will therefore ever continue to be the ultimate rule

or standard of Christian faith and practice, yet it is not the foundation of Christianity. To say, with Chillingworth, that the Bible is the religion of Protestants, is a misrepresentation both of Protestantism and of the Bible. Christianity has been called a *book religion*, because it has produced sacred books. It is, however, not a book religion in the sense in which, for instance, Mohammedanism is such, and has therefore no such danger to fear even from an unfavorable treatment of the Bible, as the religion of Mohammed has to fear from an unfriendly criticism of the Koran. In reference to the assertion that Christianity is a book religion, Bernhard Weiss says, "God be praised that it is not. Christianity from the beginning was life." The Bible did not make Christianity, but Christianity has made the Bible; and Christianity, therefore, does neither stand nor fall with any theory of the Bible.

VI.

EXEGETICAL ESSAY ON PHILIPPIANS II. 6-11.

BY REV. D. VAN PELT.

THE Apostle's immediate or particular design of this passage is to aid in enforcing the duty of humility, while exhorting the Philippian Christians to its exercise. The great instigator of all strife, and of religious strife especially, is the indulgence of pride and vain-glory—the fond feeling of one's own superiority over others. In spiritual matters this consists in thinking one's self superior, in *knowing more* or *being better*. That is, the person flatters himself that he has a more thorough understanding of the mind of the Spirit, and is therefore capable of a more correct (indeed the only orthodox) interpretation of Divine Truth. And as he can thus walk by a much clearer light than other benighted souls, he is by logical consequence also holier than others. Let this feeling prevail among religionists of opposing stripes; let this vain-glory in the breast of one opponent be pitted against that in the breast of another, and peace or reason is impossible; yielding an iota is a crime against truth, a pandering to heterodoxy; anger, bitterness and utter, irreparable rupture disgrace what might be a fair field of loving and truth-seeking controversy, in a beautiful and generous Christian spirit.

The supreme remedy then, it would seem, if men *must* differ—as all reasonable and thoughtful men *will*—must be to banish this fond pride of opinion or dogma from the mind. In lowliness of mind, on the contrary, let each esteem others better than himself. Let not every man, continues the Apostle, look (*i. e.* with proud conviction of their superiority) upon his own things, his own spiritual advantages, his own insight; but

let every man look (*i. e.* with respectful deference) upon these things in others—and from the very terms of the proposition it follows that strife cannot exist. To enforce this precept of self-forgetfulness and self-negation, Paul adduces the sublime self-sacrifice of Christ. But in the course of his detailed description of Christ's self-humiliation, the ardent mind of Paul cannot restrain itself from turning to the glorious contrast presented by Christ's exaltation *now* and *to come*. The latter stands directly and intimately connected with the former: WHEREFORE God hath highly exalted him; and the pointing out of this connection *may* serve as a further inducement to follow Christ's example of humility. If we *forget* ourselves, and *humble* ourselves, God will not forget us, and will take care of our glory; but the glory thus attained or obtained will be a *real* glory as opposed to "*vain-glory*."

Having thus duly considered the immediate intention wherewith Paul entered upon this passage, we may go on to the lesson which these sentences (once penned) convey to the reader. For these verses, such as they are, while fulfilling their part as a link in a chain of argumentation then uppermost in Paul's mind, contain an argument separately within their own limits. And it is this: that Christ through Humiliation attained to Exaltation; that He, through the Redeemer's work, reached the special glory of the Redeemer's office, preordained unto it; this glory being of sufficient magnitude and importance to be thought worthy of addition to that eternal glory belonging essentially to the Son of God. This seems obviously the leading thought of the passage. Let us now proceed to mark its development in detail.

Ver. 6. In the words ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ begins the story of that original glory which was seemingly laid aside for a while—hidden, at least, within the Incarnation—but which was to be resumed with a peculiar glory superinduced. Μορφή is, literally, the shape, form or figure of a thing; but, used in the sense of μορφή θεοῦ, would indicate the possession of the essential qualities or attributes which make up the outlines of our conception,

idea, *i. e.*, *mental form* of God. Such was the Son originally; for *ὑπαρχών* carries with it very decidedly the idea of a former glory, meaning literally "beginning to be." And to maintain this essential and original exaltation of the Son, the Apostle uses a very strong expression: it was not "robbery,"—*ἀπαργμὸν*—for Him to claim equality with God. The Greek is a strong word, indicating very violent robbery, or ravishment,* and the employment of such a word seems to convey the impression that however terrific a blasphemy and dishonoring of God for others to do so, for Him, the Son, to claim equality, was not derogatory to the Godhead. His assumption of God's attributes and honors was not a usurpation, but His natural right, inseparable from His essential Being. And this forcible instruction on the part of the Apostle leaves us with this important doctrinal conclusion, that it really takes nothing from the conception of God to entertain the conception of a second Person in the Godhead.

The diction throughout this verse gives abundant evidence that this conception was in the mind of the Apostle. The *τὸ εἶναι*, "the being equal," looking so much more to the *fact* of the equality than any other form of the verb, with a necessary *action* or *becoming* implied as connected with the equality, bears testimony to it. And more significant still is the expression *ἴσα θεῷ*. **ἴσα* is the neutral plural of the adjective, and in this form is used as an adverb. There is much force in this usage just here, therefore. Not merely *is* He equal to or with God, but the adverbial form refers us to Him as existing thus, suggests this as the very mode of His Being. He *is, exists* "equally" *as* God, as well as *with* God; *i. e.*, He *is* eternal, unoriginated, unbegun, everlasting, holy, powerful in all things the same as whatever we had attributed to God, or learned of God by

*The Revised Version has "prize"—which is quite correct if it is remembered it is "prize" as secured by violence, something like "booty;" not a "prize" obtained in legitimate ways. For this reason we had almost said that the "robbery" of the A. V. is more really expressive of the original.

Revelation. And this removes all objections on the score of a Duality. The relation is not: God *one*, and Christ or the Son *one*; the latter equal to the former in His different personality, and so furnishing the sum $1 \times 1 = 2$. But He is equally as God is; *i. e.*, it is the same conception of the Godhead we ever had, enriched by a fuller revelation as to the Essence, Being, or mode of existence of that Deity.

Ver. 7. *Ἀλλὰ* of the next verse is the announcement of a direct and immediate contrast to the things considered above, which is now to follow. And soon we discover it in the *ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν*. Yes, He did, indeed, empty or drain Himself. To human observation, and practically in many respects, He emptied Himself of His Divine attributes, laid aside the form of God, and then? He took another form, the *μορφὴν δούλου*. It was a *μορφὴν* nevertheless, NOW of a slave or bond-servant, as BEFORE of God: the essential Godhead exchanged for the very essence and excess of subordination and humility; the full conception or mental form of either, in either case, was completely satisfied.

Ver. 8. Now, then, what was this Incarnation in its relations to other men? It was both an *ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων* and a *σχήματι ὡς ἀνθρώπος*. These terms by their close juxtaposition and evidently designed contrast, seem to indicate two phases of the Incarnation. We at once notice a plural and a singular use of the same word *ἀνθρώπος*. The one *of men* looks to the race; the other *of man* has more thought of the individual. Again, *ὁμοιώματι* signifies a general likeness or resemblance; while *σχήματι* has more reference to the figure that actually resembles. Accordingly we are justified in gathering from these expressions the double assurance that the Christ was endowed with our common humanity, touching the whole race as one entity, and irrespective of the distinction between male and female, as well as clothed upon with the particular body and constitution of an individual *man*. In both phases of the Incarnation He is necessary and precious to us. Prof. Westcott remarks: "If Christ took our nature upon Him, it was not that of one

but of all. He was not one man only among men, but in Him all humanity was gathered up. And thus now, as at all times, mankind are (so to speak) organically united with Him. His death is our death; His Resurrection our Resurrection. Nothing can be plainer than the assertion of this doctrine."* And as an individual man, a real, living, breathing individuality, how much closer than a Brother and a Friend doth He draw to our hearts!

But He went further than the humiliation involved in divesting, emptying Himself of Godhead in becoming man. He descended to the lowest depths of the human condition. He not merely "humbled," he *ἐταπείνωσεν*—He debased Himself to the *θανάτος σταυροῦ*—to undergo this "death of the cross," He must, indeed, to the Greek and Roman mind stoop to degradation, for the worst of ignominy was attached to suffering by the cross. And again, in *δῆχκος*, appears a reference to the low condition which He chose to occupy. The subject allies of Athens were called *δῆχοι*; and slaves taken in battle or subdued by conquest, and servile allies, as well as serfs of the soil, were the only classes of persons liable to crucifixion. See, then, how all these terms serve to combinedly intensify the depth of Christ's humiliation; as *δούλος* he was *δῆχος* to the *θανάτος σταυροῦ*. And the accumulation of these forcible expressions serves to enhance the immense distance between the *μορφὴν δούλου* and the *μορφὴ θεοῦ*, between the lowest degradation to which even the degraded condition of a slave could be put—the death of the cross—and the original glory of equality with God.

Ver. 9. But the very lowest abyss is immediately at the foot of the loftiest precipice. And with one mighty bound we rise from the depths to the most exalted heights. We are assisted in the ascent by several significant words *διὸ καὶ*—wherefore—also, *διὸ διὰ ὃ*—through this—this former condition—because it was assumed; *καὶ*, i. e., ALSO—because the former occurred—then *in addition* must another condition be arrived at: the one

* Gospel of the Resurrection, 4th Ed., London, p. 177.

cannot remain unfollowed by the other. But who is instrumental in bringing about the following state of things? ὁ θεός—as opposed to the ἐαυτὸν of the “debasing;” that HE did Himself, GOD does the other. And just WHAT does God do for Him, or unto Him? A very strong expression is employed to convey the action: God αὐτὸν ἐπερύψωσεν. Simple ὕψω does not seem sufficient, that means only to *exalt*. The Apostle strains after higher thought; it is ἐπερύψω—Christ was *super-exalted*, exceedingly, inconceivably exalted by God. And as an unmistakable evidence of that more than ordinary exaltation, God grants Him a distinguished favor. He does not merely “give;” He ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα—χαρίζομαι is equivalent to *gratificari*; thus God gratifies Him, or graces Him with a name that shall be an everlasting symbol, an inseparable seal of the exaltation that was His. *The name* was an important factor in the Revelation and Acknowledgment of the glory of God. The name of God needed a special commandment to guard it, and its defamation was a crime separate from all other offenses against God. And it is worthy of notice that there is an important difference here between the *Textus Receptus* and the best MSS. The former has simply ὄνομα without the article, thus reading as in A. V., “God has given Him *a name*.” The latter have the article τὸ ὄνομα—thus reading properly and significantly—as in R. V., “God has given Him *THE name*.” And what *the name* is, is immediately explained. We had hardly dared think it of Jesus Christ; for we do not always clearly perceive the previous glory of the equality of Godhead, inasmuch as He appeals so strongly to our faith in His “emptied” and dying condition. But now, in so many words—*God’s words, inspired words*—the amazing fact is stated: τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἐπὶ πάντων ὄνομα.

None but Jews, or those versed in Jewish history and opinions could attach much importance to so labored a distinction about names. In the case of a person such as Paul, an “Hebrew of the Hebrews,” it means much. It is well known what the name of Jehovah—the mere name itself—was to the Israelite. It was not to be spoken and had not been pronounced

for so many ages, that its vowellation could not be supplied by the Masorites, except from the word *Adonai*, which had always been used in its stead. The copyist of Holy Writ stopped when he came to this name on the page, changed both pen and ink to record the one word representing it, and then resumed former utensils. With this thoroughly well known superstitious reverence for this great and awful name before his mind, there can be no reasonable doubt that when Paul mentions (with such evident design to make his language significant), *the name above every name*, he had reference to the august name *JEHOVAH*. We are the more justified in this conclusion because *Jehovah* was invariably represented by *κύριος*, by the *LXXa*, and even some of the superstitious reverence for the former, was transferred to this Greek form by those who employed the *LXX* more familiarly than the Hebrew original; and that is the very term to which the climax in these verses is leading us. It seems indeed of a piece with the *μορφῇ θεοῦ*, and no additional distinction, to attach such *ὅπερ πᾶν ὄνομα* name to Christ. And yet there is in this something different from the mere equality with Godhead. *Jehovah* was peculiarly the Covenant Name of God. By the consummation of that covenant in Christ, the supreme name of the Covenant-God becomes His. And this well sustains the use of the term *ὡς*.

Ver. 10. The direct purpose of giving the Redeemer this exalted name, is that the inevitable consequences of possessing it, should follow. The awful name commanded the most reverent adoration of heaven, of earth, of hell; of all the physical and moral universe. It is granted to Christ, *ὅνα*, in order that all the vast and varied dominions of the universe *should*, and now it is given, they *must* adore and revere Him.

The first appearance of this actual reverence shall be indicated in the *πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ*, the bowing of every knee, the visible symbol in the external act. And it will be an universal homage, for *ἐπουρανίων*, *ἐπιγείων*, *καταχθονίων*, will engage in it. The plurals of adjectives, Winer tells us, are concretes, and denote whole classes of things; they are made more specific by the

context; so here, though otherwise we might be warranted in understanding only inanimate things, the "tongues confessing" of the context assures us that the act of homage is to come from heavenly, earthly and infernal intelligences. Or, perhaps, we should be careful to define the term *καταθονίων* more justly. *Zeus καταθονίων* was the designation of Pluto; therefore it may well be that not merely infernal or demoniac beings are meant, but also souls in hades, souls in the intermediate state, after death and before the judgment-day. For, according to some authorities and the translation in the new version, these created intelligences, wherever they are, bow *in*, instead of *at* or *before* the name of Jesus, makes serious difficulty for the argument that the name given to Him is the all-adorable name Jehovah. Is not this simply using the name of Jesus as an intercessory means of approach to Jehovah,* instead of homage, to that name itself? But Winer remarks: "Phil. ii. 10 seems to require separate treatment; *ὄνομα* here refers to *ὄνομα* in ver. 9, and *ἐν ὀνόματι* denotes the name upon which those that bow the knee unite, on which united, all (*πάν γόνυ*) worship. The name which Jesus has received moves all to united adoration." (N. T. Grammar, p. 390.)

Ver. 11. Besides the (as it were) involuntary reverence *wrung* from the universe by the power of the awful name, there must *also*—*καὶ*—come the free admission that He is worthy. And this appears likewise: *Πᾶσα γλῶσσα*—every tongue (as every knee, distributed above), must supplement the knee; a mental, a spiritual, a soul-exercise must accompany the mere bodily: words spoken, symbolizing the thoughts and feelings of the inmost being, must testify to this more spiritual and voluntary adoration. Yet it will be more valuable if it come after some reluctance; it will have more the air of a consent of the creature's free opinion and volition. Such seems the force of

* It need not be said that the "*In the Name*" of the Revised Version, if attention is called to the distinction, is perfectly consistent with this idea of insisting *on* the name, and then *in* the name combined by worship.

ἐξομολογήσεται: they admit, confess this exalted name; that it belongs to Him is a necessary conclusion long sought to be escaped from, but at last flowing in upon them as an irresistible conviction.

Yes, their tongues at last confess *ὅτι Κύριος* I. X. ! that Jesus Christ is *Κύριος*. And here we reach the climax of the passage; the Name above every name is then *that* once given to the Eternal Spirit who entered into covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, including their seed in the faith. Nor is there the least apprehension called for, that the Excellent Majesty of that Eternal Jehovah will suffer, or that His Supreme Deity will be debased hereby. It is *εἰς δόξαν Πατρός*, unto the very enhancement of the Supreme Glory of the Father: His Being and Perfections are more wondrously unfolded through this enlarged conception of the true nature of the Godhead. (cf. no robbery.)

And now, in conclusion, taking in the significance of this entire passage, we wish to ask a question and to draw an inference. We ask: Why must the glory of Redemption be considered as added to the original and essential glory of the Son of God? Why, besides that self-sufficient excellence, wholly independent of men's or angels' acknowledgment and praise, could it be thought worth while to add this worship of the highest kind rendered by men and angels? Christ might have saved men just the same, and yet no special point need have been made of any particular exaltation as the reward of it. What did the Eternal Godhead of Christ need of rewards, what could be added to His joy or perfection by this additional distinction of a name already His in so far as Father and Son were inseparably one in the blessed Trinity? The only reason seems to lie in the fact that with just this Person of the Trinity (guarding ourselves against the inadequacy of the term Person while we use it), it pleased the Godhead to connect the human nature. It was Jesus Christ to whom was given that *ὄνομα ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα*; the human name that was linked so closely with the name *Κύριος*, Jehovah. And this meant, not that the human

nature could be deified, but that in its perfection, sinlessness, unsullied holiness, it could have the closest communion with the unsullied holiness of the Supreme Deity. And the clear illustration of this fact was an essential element in Redemption, for it was a fact calculated to stir the souls of men ; calculated to furnish the impulse of an unbounded hope ; calculated to create an abhorrence of the sin which had made so glorious a humanity so abject and polluted. . And when the Spirit of God had regenerated the heart, the character, the conduct—this exaltation of the Human Nature in Jesus Christ stood as the mark for the prize of the high calling of God after which to strive ; as the measure of the stature of the fulness of perfect manhood and womanhood, in Christ, unto which we must all come !

And, finally, an impressive, practical inference, touching upon the study of the nature of Christ, may be drawn from the intense contrast here presented between the Humiliation and Exaltation of the Saviour. As a man, He could not be presented more intensely, more humbly, more wretchedly *human* : as divine, He could not be presented more intensely, more exaltedly, more gloriously *divine*, than in this passage. Yet the latter is reached through the profound consideration of the former. When we have fathomed the lowest depth of human degradation—the death of the cross—we leap up to the very throne of God. “WHEREFORE,” *by reason* of that very depth, He is now upon the heights. So, it seems to us, it will never hurt us to look intently upon the human side of Jesus. “Belief in the Human Character of Christ’s Humanity,” observes F. W. Robertson, “must be antecedent to belief in His Divine Origin.” The nearer our own hearts, and hearts’ love, get to Him in this single observation of Him even, the more readily shall we discover that He is infinitely more than *we* are, than *man* is. The very book that discusses His human nature with the greatest freedom consistent with a reverent faith, finds in the nature of His moral Kingship credentials that belonged to Jehovah Him-

self at the beginning, and are inseparable from Divinity.* Of another book inconsistent with all Christian faith in its view of Jesus as mere man—Renan's "Life of Jesus"—the late Senator Matt. Carpenter said to a friend: "I arose from the second reading fully convinced that Christ was divine." Even those who with hostile intent would direct our thoughts to the humanity of Jesus, in the hope of keeping us down upon this lower plane—even they cannot so present Him humanly but that a candid and penetrating mind is forced to behold the Divinity. But if with devout intent, in order to understand Him and love Him better, we fix upon His Manhood our concentrated gaze, near alike to our common human nature as we may find Him, we shall not be long in discovering the "*wherefore*" that raises our conceptions to the right hand of the throne of the Majesty on high!

* We refer to "Ecce Homo." Some may dispute the assertion that it is a book consistent with a reverent faith. But certainly after reading the chapter entitled "Christ's Royalty," we could not but feel that, whether consciously or unconsciously, the author had brought us very near to a convincing view of the Divinity of Christ. His own words in one part of it might convey that hint: "the very works for which the nation chiefly hymned their Jehovah, he [Jesus] undertook in His name to do."

VII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE UNITY OF THE TRUTH IN CHRISTIANITY AND EVOLUTION. By J. Max Hark, D.D. John B. Alden, publisher: New York, 1888, pp. 293.

As the title implies, this book has been written to demonstrate the idea of an essential harmony between the principles of the theory of evolution and the fundamental principles of the Christian religion. The theory of evolution has come to rule to a very large extent the scientific and philosophical thinking of the age. A large number of the profoundest thinkers in all departments of intellectual activity accept it, in some form, as the most satisfactory explanation of the method of the production of the universe. And intelligent men in all professions and walks of life have their minds exercised in regard to it, and are inquiring as to its bearing on Christian truth. In these circumstances, the author of the book before us thinks it is time that Christian theology should enter into a serious reckoning with the theory, and, if possible, come to friendly terms with it. Mere contradiction and denunciation will not do. That would only result in driving from the fold of the Church many of her best and strongest minds. Of the possibility of a reconciliation the author has no doubt. He has faith in Christianity, and has faith also in science, ruled, as it is at the present time so largely, by the idea of evolution. He believes, and we think rightly, that Christianity interpreted truly in the light of the Sacred Scriptures is not in conflict, but in harmony with a consistent evolutionary interpretation of the universe.

The book before us is the fruit of this faith, and is intended to be a help to intelligent readers, showing them how they may be sincere Christians at the same time that they are evolutionists. After an introduction portraying to some extent the general mental attitude of the age in regard to science and religion, the author treats, from the standpoint of evolution, successively, in so many different sections, the subjects of *God, Providence, Prayer, Man, Sin, Salvation and Religion*. We cannot here give even an outline of the discussion of these several topics, but must content ourselves with a few specimen thoughts, which may serve to indicate to the reader the drift of the author's mind. In regard to God he holds that evolution does not necessarily lead to agnosticism, although he quotes

with approbation Herbert Spencer's idea that God may be "a mode of being as much transcending intelligence and will as these transcend mechanical motion." He exposes the deistic conception of God as an immensely magnified man sitting somewhere outside of the universe, and lays stress upon the divine immanence in the world. Providence he defines "to be nothing but God unfolding Himself; the expression in the world of His inherent nature; subordinating, subjecting all things and occurrences thereto; bringing all into conformity with himself." The end of *prayer*, the author holds, "is to bring man into conformity with God, not to bring God into conformity with man;" and the chief means through which God answers prayer is prayer itself. On the subject of *man* it is shown that, while evolution renders important service to the cause of Christian truth by demonstrating the unity of the race, it does not invalidate the dictates of the moral sense, but rather invests them with increased dignity and force. The origin of sin the author explains as essentially a "reversion to type," and the "law of sin in our members" as "simply our animal nature derived from our rude ancestors." Yet, in spite of this natural origin, sin is really sin and involves guilt because it is now committed voluntarily. On *salvation* the author rejects the substitutionary punishment doctrine of the atonement, and lays stress on the idea of a regeneration and sanctification of the sinner by means of forces contained in his "environment," in which he includes Christ and the Christian economy. Religion, finally, is defined as "the bringing of the *whole man* into correspondence with the divine."

It is not to be expected, of course, that either theologians or scientific evolutionists will all agree with the positions taken in this book, although as to his general aim and tendency they may be of one mind with the author. As there is more than one system of theology, so there is more than one theory of evolution; and accordingly there will doubtless be objection made from different standpoints. To many, and among them the present writer, the view presented of the nature and personality of God, for example, will not be entirely satisfactory. It will be contended that the idea of personality does not necessarily imply limitation, and that God's mental faculties may be essentially like ours without being for that reason finite. That this is the case will be inferred from the Biblical doctrine of the divine image in man, but especially from the fact of the *incarnation*. If there were not an original *kinship* between the nature of God and the nature of man, they could not have been brought together in the unity of one person, as in Christ. So also many will not be satisfied with the view that the chief value of prayer consists in its reflex influence on the person praying. While they will agree with the author in rejecting the idea of an eternal divine fore-ordination, as well as the idea of miraculous in-

terpositions in the course of the world, as the explanatory ground of divine answers to prayer, they will, nevertheless, cling to the idea that God can and does answer prayer in a *real, objective* way. If man's physical acts will elicit from the energy of the Absolute Being immanent in nature objective results which, but for such acts, would not have followed, why should not his purely moral acts, such as prayer, be followed by like objective results? So again many will not be satisfied with the view which is here presented of the origin of sin. While they will hail the theory of evolution as an explanation of the fact of hereditary sin, or of the persistence of moral depravity in human nature, they will not look to evolution as an explanation of the origin of sin in the race. They will not be able to regard the origin of sin as merely the result of the operation of the law of "reversion to type," for they will not admit that human sinfulness and vice have anything corresponding to them in the animal world at the present time. In the animal, aptitude and propensity are in harmony; that is to say, the animal is ever inclined to do what its nature and structure intend it for. But this is not the case with man. His propensities and appetites are often in disagreement with the true intent of his nature. There is here a *perversion* of nature, not merely a reversion to the original type of nature. The theory of evolution, interpreted in a theistic sense, will serve to explain the origin of man as a free agent,—that is, free in a *moral and limited* sense; but the origin of sin must be sought in man's free agency.

But it is not our purpose here to criticise the book before us. Some positions perhaps fairly deducible from his language the author would probably repudiate himself. With the object and aim of the book we are in full accord. And we commend it as an earnest effort towards the solution of a grave and difficult problem,—a problem, moreover, that will press upon the mind of the Church until it has reached a satisfactory solution. The author deserves the thanks of all who are sincerely interested in the progress of religion and in the welfare of the Church, for taking the problem earnestly in hand, and giving us so excellent a book. The book will be found to be helpful and stimulating even by those who may not be able to endorse all its views; and even such, if there are any, as may entirely dissent from its fundamental position, and choose to see in evolution only an enemy of the faith, will in this book find food for wholesome thought.

It only remains to say that the book is written in a clear and sprightly style, well adapting it to the general reader; and that it is gotten up by Mr. Alden in the best style of the book-making art, being printed on good, heavy paper, in small pica type, which is a pleasure to the eye. It is sold at the marvelously low price of 80 cents.

W. RUPP.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY. By J. H. W. Stuckenberg, D.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1888. Price, \$2.00.

This work is not a philosophical encyclopædia, nor an introduction to any particular philosophical system, but, as its title indicates, an introduction to the study of philosophy itself. It is intended, accordingly, more especially for those who desire to prepare themselves for philosophical pursuits; yet its character is such that advanced students will also find it helpful as a review and as a preparation for a new and more vigorous start in philosophical research. Nor will the general reader find it unworthy of his attention. The information given in it is indeed such as every intelligent and well-educated person should possess. In our opinion, moreover, it might be profitably introduced as a text-book in our higher institutions of learning.

The arrangement of the different chapters of the book is logical and admirably suited to the wants of students and readers generally. In a brief introduction the author sets forth the requisites for a successful study of philosophy, and gives an idea of some of the ways which lead to philosophic thought. In the first chapter the nature of philosophy is discussed and its purpose defined. In the three chapters which immediately follow, the Relation of Philosophy to Religion, to Natural Science, and to Empirical Psychology, is carefully considered and determined. Chapter fifth treats of the divisions of Philosophy. A chapter is then devoted to each division, namely, to the Theory of Knowledge (Noetics), to Metaphysics, to Æsthetics, and to Ethics. The closing chapter treats of the Spirit and the Method in the Study of Philosophy. In an Appendix some of the points referred to in the different chapters are more fully explained and discussed. The book also contains an index, as well as a table of contents.

For such a book there may be justly said to have been an urgent need, and every page of the volume before us gives evidence of the superior qualifications of Dr. Stuckenberg for the preparation of it. Throughout he shows that he is thoroughly acquainted with the subject of which he treats, and that he has taken great pains to present in a clear and satisfactory manner just such information as is most needed. We heartily commend the book to all our readers. It is especially deserving of a place in every minister's library.

THE ANCIENT WORLD AND CHRISTIANITY. By E. De Pressensé, D.D., author of "The Early Years of Christianity," "A Study of Origins," etc. Translated by Annie Harwood Holmden. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. Price, \$1.75.

Dr. De Pressensé is distinguished as a sound theologian, a thorough scholar and a profound thinker. His earlier works, of which "Jesus Christ, His Times, Life and Works," "The Early Years of Christianity," and "A Study of Origins," are perhaps best known,

are all works of superior value. The merits of the present volume are no less decided. Its object is to present an account of the moral and religious history of the ancient world, some knowledge of which, the author holds, is necessary to our entering intelligently into the history and progress of Christianity. Such knowledge, he also maintains, will help to make manifest the error of the growing school which disputes the originality and the distinctive character of Christianity, maintaining that it gives us nothing more than a synthesis of pre-existing elements under the form of a new myth. His careful review of the religious evolution of the ancient world, he thinks, makes it seem clear that the Founder of the religion of the Gospel was not a merely historic personage, and that that religion was not the mere confluence of the currents of earlier religions. Christianity, he is thoroughly convinced, differs from the religions of the ancient world especially in this—that while in them a deliverer was sought and slowly prepared for, in it a deliverer is actually come unto men. He concludes, therefore, that, “whether men will have it so or no, the Cross of Christ divides two worlds, and forms the great landmark of history. It interprets all the past; it embraces all the future; and, however fierce the conflict waged around it, it still is, and shall be through all the ages, the symbol of victory.”

The work itself consists of an Introduction, five distinct Books, and a Conclusion, together with a preface, table of contents and a good index. In the introduction the purpose of the work is at some length set forth. Of the five books that follow, the first treats of the “Ancient East,” in four chapters, in which are discussed the starting-point of religious evolution, the Chaldeo-Assyrian religion, the religion of Egypt, and the religion of Phœnicia; the second deals with the religious development of the Oriental Aryans, in two chapters, devoted respectively to the consideration of the primitive Aryans and the religion of Zoroaster; the third has to do with the religion of India, in three chapters, in which the religion of the Vedas, the transformation of the religion of the Vedas after the settlement of the Vedic-Aryans on the banks of the Ganges, and Buddha, are considered; the fourth discusses Hellenic Paganism, in three chapters, which treat of its first period, the religion of Greece in its full development, and Greek Philosophy; and the fifth relates to the Greco-Roman Paganism and its decline, and in two chapters describes the change that passed over ancient paganism from the time of Alexander and under the Romans, and the pagan world at the coming of Christ. The result of the review made in these different books is briefly presented in the Conclusion. The first chapter of the first book, which treats of the starting-point of the religious evolution, is especially deserving of careful study, in view of some of the theories concerning the origin of religion advanced and held by popular writers of the day. Every part of

the work, however, is replete with highly important instruction and entitled to careful consideration. Those who would acquaint themselves thoroughly with the religious history of mankind will find the entire volume of special interest and value.

The work, we would yet add, is translated into strong, clear and idiomatic English; is printed on good paper and in large, distinct type, and is well bound. It is indeed in every respect an attractive volume, and one that will abundantly repay reading. There have been of late few more valuable contributions to theological literature than this by Dr. De Pressensé, who, in an age of skepticism and destructive criticism, is a firm and able defender of the faith once delivered to the saints.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS. By Marcus Dods, D.D., author of "Israel's Iron Age," "The Parables of Our Lord," "The Prayer that Teaches to Pray," etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. Price, \$1.50.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK. By the Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D., Dean of Armagh, author of "Christ Bearing Witness to Himself," "As He that Soweth," etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. Price, \$1.50.

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS AND PHILEMON. By Alexander Maclaren, D.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. Price, \$1.50.

These three volumes belong to the series entitled the "Expositor's Bible," edited by Rev. W. R. Nicholl, editor of the *London Expositor*. The different volumes are each complete in itself. They are not commentaries in the strict sense of the term, but are made up of expository lectures on the contents of the different books of the Bible. All the volumes of the series will be prepared by persons occupying a foremost position among the preachers and theologians of the day. Though the volumes will all be of a popular character and suited to the wants of the general reader, yet, nevertheless, regard will be had in them to the latest results of Biblical scholarship. They will, therefore, be found valuable not only to laymen, but also to ministers.

The volumes before us are all possessed of superior merit. The expositions which they give are, without exception, fresh and vigorous. We have not found a dull paragraph in any of them. They are, moreover, admirably suited to the wants of our times, and can scarcely fail to confirm in the faith those who read them and to broaden and deepen their knowledge of spiritual things. To ministers they can be heartily and confidently recommended as models of the way in which the great subjects concerning which there is so much controversy at present should be treated by them in their pulpit ministrations. As a specimen of the course pursued, we give

the following from the opening chapter of "The Book of Genesis," by Dr. Dods:

"If any one is in search of accurate information regarding the age of this earth, or its relation to the sun, moon and stars, or regarding the order in which plants and animals have appeared upon it, he is referred to recent text-books in astronomy, geology and palæontology. No one for a moment dreams of referring a serious student of these subjects to the Bible as a source of information. It is not the object of the writers of Scripture to impart physical instruction or to enlarge the bounds of scientific knowledge. But if any one wishes to know what connection the world has with God, if he seeks to trace back all that now is to the very fountain-head of life, if he desires to discover some unifying principle, some illuminating purpose in the history of this earth, then we confidently refer him to these and the subsequent chapters of Scripture as his safest, and indeed his only, guide to the information he seeks. Every writing must be judged by the object the writer has in view. If the object of the writer of these chapters was to convey physical information, then certainly it is imperfectly fulfilled. But if his object was to give an intelligible account of God's relation to the world, and to man, then it must be owned that he has been successful in the highest degree.

"It is, therefore, unreasonable to allow our reverence for this writing to be lessened because it does not anticipate the discoveries of physical science; or to repudiate its authority in its own department of truth because it does not give us information which it formed no part of the writer's object to give."

Though each volume of the series, as already stated, is complete in itself, yet they are all of uniform size, are printed in large type, on good paper, and are strongly bound. On account of their superior qualities in every respect, they will prove an ornament as well as a valuable acquisition to any religious library.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE: Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D.D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London, author of "Ecce Deus," "The Paraclete," "The Priesthood of Christ," "Springdale Abbey," "The Inner Life of Christ," "Ad Clerum," "The Ark of God," "Apostolic Life," "Tyne Chylde," "Weaver Stephen," etc. Vol. VII. Samuel xviii.-1 Kings xlii. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 18 & 20 Astor Place. 1887. Price, \$1.50.

With this volume more than one-half of the "People's Bible" is completed. For though this is only volume seventh of the Old Testament series, it is volume thirteenth of the entire work, which is to consist of twenty-five volumes. Only twelve volumes, therefore, remain to be published. To prepare such a work is a great undertaking for one person. The amount of labor required would, to an ordinary man, be perfectly appalling. Dr. Parker, however,

is no ordinary man, and it now looks very much as if he would succeed in accomplishing the task, notwithstanding the other work he has done and is engaged in doing. The wonderful resources at his command are evident in the fact that the present volume is possessed of the same originality and brilliancy of conception that characterized those that have preceded it. There is no falling off in power. Those who have found instruction and spiritual quickening in the earlier volumes will find the same in this. Every page abounds in sparkling gems of thought and in life-giving power.

CHRISTIANITY IN THE UNITED STATES from the First Settlement Down to the Present Time. By Daniel Dorchester, D.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt, Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1888. Price, \$4.50.

A stately volume, whose exterior is quite worthy of the contents. These latter are not accounts of the different religious *denominations* of this country, but rather, as its title imports, a well-connected history of the workings and progress of *Christianity* in the different Churches. The author divides this history into *two eras*, the Colonial Era and the National Era; and under the first era he gives us eleven chapters, while under the second he has three periods, each sub-divided into chapters. An instance of the careful and thorough research of the author may be found in the fact that he gives the year 1720 as the year Rev. Philip Boehm, of the German Reformed Church, began his ministry, instead of 1727 as the authorities gave it until the recent discovery of new authorities. The section on our religious history in Colonial times is elaborate and highly *interesting*, notwithstanding the charge made by Mathew Arnold that we have nothing interesting in this country. The beginning of our religious history is specially important in order to understand properly our subsequent developments in that sphere. These contain the principles from which the development of life and activity proceed. Then we are prepared to follow up the modifications and changes that have come in through the unfolding of the religious history of the nation.

Very important and radical changes have taken place in some of the religious bodies of this country. A single instance may be found in the early development of Puritanism in New England, which existed for sixty years as a *theocracy*, opposing and persecuting every form of belief that was not in accord with its teaching, but which in later times favored and supported the freedom of both Church and State. Our space will not allow us to go over in detail the different sections of this work, but we can assure the readers of this notice that it is carefully brought down to the present time. It is valuable, not only for one reading, but also for constant reference. In this respect it is like an encyclopædia; it is such for the Christianity of America. Knowledge that would have to be sought for through many works is here brought within the compass

of one volume. We believe the work is worth the price, and it will be an acquisition to any one's library.

THE BOOK OF JOB (according to the Version of 1885), with an Explanatory and Practical Commentary, Enriched with Illustrations from some of the most eminent Modern Expositors, and a Critical Introduction. By Daniel Curry, D.D., LL.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1887. Price, \$2.00.

Although for some time before the public, this volume has but recently come into our hands from the publishers. Within the three hundred pages that fill the volume the author furnishes an able and satisfactory commentary for the general reader on the book of Job. After saying in the Introduction, "Respecting the Age, Place and Authorship, we have not any certain knowledge," he nevertheless goes on to open up to the reader what is *most probable* concerning each of these points, and this probable knowledge proves a great satisfaction, after all, in the absence of any *certain* knowledge.

With the best authorities the author places the age of the book of Job in the period of the Solomonic literature, and not, as some writers have placed it, in the quite early ages of the Mosaic history.

"As to the writer, he must have been a Hebrew, and almost certainly of Jerusalem, and one who drank deeply of the learning of his nation; a man of profound thought and broad culture, and thoroughly penetrated with the religious principles of the people, and the peer of the few first-class poetical geniuses of the world."

As the book is a poem, the characters, Job, his friends, Eliphaz, Bildad, Zophar, Elihu and Satan, must be regarded as fictitious characters, yet true representatives of the times, and eminently worthy of a place in the inspired record.

The exposition is not for technical scholars, but for the general reader of the Bible. As such it is one of the best we have read on the subject. In an Appendix the author gives the "Legends concerning Job." Altogether the book is worthy of commendation, and we believe it will prove satisfactory to any one who may procure it.

THE FIRE OF GOD'S ANGER: or, *Light from the Old Testament to the New Testament Teaching Concerning Future Punishment.* By L. C. Baker, author of "Mystery of Creation and Man;" Editor of "Words of Reconciliation." Published at office of "Words of Reconciliation," No. 2022 Delancy Place, Philadelphia, Pa., 1887. Price, 75 cents.

Mr. L. C. Baker, whose untitled name appears as the author of this little volume of two hundred and sixty-eight pages, it seems, was a minister in good and regular standing in the Presbyterian Church, but on account of certain views which he held and taught upon the subject of future punishment and the resurrection, and

which were pronounced contrary to the doctrines of that Church, he was permitted to withdraw from its ministry. He now publishes a small monthly magazine, in which his views on these subjects are promulgated. In this magazine he says: "We do indeed believe that to the unregenerate there has been secured by Christ the gift of another life through resurrection, but nothing has been further from our teaching than that it is a benefit of the same kind and order as that which reaches the regenerate. Only he that is born of God can inherit the kingdom of God. But we do hold that, as the wages of sin is death,—including the bondage and privation and misery of that death-state into which the outcast spirit goes,—so resurrection is essentially recovery from death, bringing back, even where there cleaves to it a heritage of evil from the past, the opportunities of life." This quotation gives some idea of the peculiar views entertained by the author of the volume here noticed. He attaches to the resurrection some sort of remedial agency even for those who die unregenerate, and publishes this volume in support of this view, in which he presents the arguments he has gathered from the Old Testament. We have not had time as yet to examine these Scriptural arguments, but from what has been presented, the reader may be able to judge whether he desires to examine the subject in the light of this volume.

ST. PAUL AT ATHENS. *Spiritual Christianity in Relation to Some Aspects of Modern Thought. Nine Sermons Preached in St. Stephen's Church, Westbourne Park.* By Charles Shakspeare, B.A., Assistant Curate. With a Preface by the Rev. Canon Farrar, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 743 and 745 Broadway.

The name attached to the preface to this volume is sufficient to commend the work itself. The chapters treated are, The City and The Apostle, Culture and Faith, Sensuous and Spiritual Religion, Paganism and Christianity—First Century A. D., Philosophy and Christianity—First Century A. D., Ancient and Modern Skepticism, The Epicureans and Modern Life, The Stoics and Modern Thought, Humanity and God.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE BLESSED LIFE. By Mark Guy Pearse, author of "Thoughts on Holiness," etc., etc. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1887. Price, 75 cents.

A nicely gotten-up little volume, and its contents are quite worthy of the form in which they are presented. It is well suited for the Sunday-school library, and also for those of mature age who desire assistance in private meditation upon the new life of the believer.

A NEW RENDERING OF THE HEBREW PSALMS INTO ENGLISH VERSE, with Notes, etc., etc. By Abraham Coles, M.D., LL.D. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1, 3 and 5 Bond Street, 1888. Price, \$1.25.

The Psalter is always in place in the library and on the study

table. This version of the Psalms is published in good style. It contains an introduction of over fifty pages, giving a history of French, English and Scotch metrical versions of the Psalms, together with interesting facts connected with each of them.

A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF PSALMS. By Professor Franz Delitzsch, D.D., of Leipzig. From the Latest Edition: Especially Revised by the Author. In Three Volumes. Vol. I. Translated by the Rev. David Eaton, M.A., and Rev. James E. Duguid. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Astor Place. Price, \$2.00.

This volume belongs to the Foreign Biblical Library, edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., editor of the "Expositor," and now in course of publication in this country by Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls. Of the merits of the present volume the name of the author, Professor Franz Delitzsch, in itself is a sufficient guarantee. In his attainments in biblical and post-biblical Hebrew, he is, indeed, so pre-eminent, that he has been called "The Christian Talmudist." All his writings are of great value, but especially is this the case as regards his commentaries, which are enriched by the best results of the most thorough modern scholarship. His Commentary on the Psalms was first published in two volumes in 1869. A second edition appeared in 1867, a third in 1873, and a fourth in 1883. Each succeeding edition has been an improvement on the one that preceded it. The present translation has been made from an interleaved copy of the last edition, with the author's latest additions and corrections in manuscript, and, accordingly, represents his present matured opinions. Of the many commentaries on the Psalms that have from time to time been published, this is undoubtedly the most complete and trustworthy. In tone it is thoroughly evangelical. It ought to find a place in every minister's library.

PALESTINE IN THE TIME OF CHRIST. By Edmond Stapfer, D.D., Professor in the Protestant Theological Faculty of Paris. Translated by Annie Harwood Holmden. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. Price, \$2.50.

We called attention to this work at some length in the January number of this REVIEW. In the favorable opinion there expressed, a further examination and use of the book fully confirms us. We are pleased, therefore, to state that it is now published by Messrs. A. C. Armstrong & Son, in cheaper, yet no less attractive and substantial form. The work is deserving of a very general circulation. Not only ministers, but also Sunday-school teachers will find it a valuable possession.

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY. By the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary. Vol. V. Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society. Price, \$1.50.

This, as indicated on the title-page, is the fifth volume of these

Discussions. Many more volumes, we hope, will follow, as the work truly supplies a real want. Its object, as has been heretofore stated in this REVIEW, "is to answer the question, which every earnest student of theology and ecclesiastical subjects may well be supposed to ask at the close of each year, viz: What has been done in the different fields of sacred learning during the last twelve months, and what are the latest results of such studies?" The work itself is divided, according to the divisions of theology, into four parts, treating respectively of Exegetical Theology of the Old Testament and of the New; Historic Theology; Systematic Theology, and Practical Theology. The contents of the first part, in the present volume, have been furnished by Prof. Samuel Ives Curtiss and Prof. George H. Gilbert, the former reviewing the Exegetical Theology of the Old Testament and the latter that of the New Testament. The contents of the second part have been supplied by Prof. Hugh M. Scott; those of the third by Prof. Geo. Nye Boardman, and those of the fourth by Prof. G. B. Wilcox and Prof. Franklin W. Fisk—the first treating of Pastoral Theology and the second of Homiletics. In each department the books pertaining to that department, that are of importance and that have been published within the year, are reviewed. The drift of the reviewers is to dwell more especially upon works that deviate somewhat from the beaten path, and in these writings to call attention to what is new and claims to be better than what is already known. In this way the reader is kept fully abreast of the theological movements of the day, and, at the same time, informed as to the value of the various books that have been published during the current year, both in this country and in Europe. The reviews are all prepared with great care, and give a fair and impartial statement of the character and contents of the different books noticed in them. Besides this, they abound in valuable criticisms which often throw much light upon the subject under consideration. As a mere guide in the purchase of books the volume is worth double its cost. For our part, we should not like to be without it.

FIVE MINUTE SERMONS TO CHILDREN. Delivered weekly in the Methodist Episcopal Churches of Holley, N. Y., and East Bloomfield, N. Y., during the years 1880–1885. By Rev. William Armstrong, of Genesee Conference. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1887. Price, 80 cents.

It is desirable that children should attend the services of the Church as well as those of the Sunday-school. There is, however, a growing tendency on their part to neglect the Church. How can they be drawn to it? This is a question which has perplexed many an earnest and faithful pastor. The author of the volume before us thinks the way is to address short sermons expressly to the children. Thirty minute sermons, he holds, are too long for them, as

they cannot follow a long train of reasoning. They want only one thing at a time. A five minute sermon is, therefore, what they need. By preaching such sermons to them, he informs us in the preface of his book, he has been enabled to get the larger number of children under his pastoral care to attend the Church services. Of the sermons he has thus preached he gives one hundred specimens in the present volume. So far as we have examined these sermons, they are pointed and aptly convey sound instruction. Children could hardly help being interested in them. We commend them to those who would learn how to address children in such a way as to hold their attention and interest them in the truths of the Gospel.

NEW SCIENCE OF ELOCUTION. The Elements and Principles of Vocal Expression, in Lessons, with Exercises and Selections Systematically Arranged for Acquiring the Art of Reading and Speaking. By Rev. S. S. Hamill, A.M., Chicago, Ill., late Professor of Rhetoric, English Literature and Elocution, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill., State University, Columbia, Mo. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1887. Price, \$1.00.

The design of this work is to present the elements and principles of vocal expression in a plain, simple and scientific manner. The author believes that elocution should be studied as a science as well as practiced as an art, and maintains that only when it is studied in our colleges and universities as a science, and its principles are known and practiced, will good speaking be the rule and not, as now, the rare exception. The work is highly recommended by some of the ablest and most successful educators in our country, and, we believe, has been introduced into some of our higher institutions of learning as a text-book. Besides the instruction given in it, it contains also a large number of interesting selections for practice. The work, moreover, is printed on good paper, in good type and is well bound.

WOMAN, FIRST AND LAST, and What She Has Done. By Mrs. E. J. Richmond, author of "The Jeweled Serpent," "Zoa Rodman," "Drifting and Anchored," "Alice Grant," "Adopted," "Harry the Prodigal," "The Fatal Dower," "The Two Paths," "Hope Raymond," "The McAllisters," "The Harewoods," etc. Two volumes. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1887. Price, \$2.00.

These two handsome volumes of about three hundred duodecimo pages each, are made up of sketches of the lives and characters of sixty-five women who achieved more or less distinction in their day and generation, beginning with Eve and ending with Miss Harriet Hosmer. The object of the author in writing them was not to present any new facts in the histories of the characters portrayed, but rather to prove, as she tells us in her preface, by these accumulated testimonies, *the power of woman for good or evil*, and to show

by the stern logic of facts that *intellect has no sex*. All these sketches are gracefully written, and in them much interesting information is given concerning the famous women who are the subjects of them. As none of the sketches are very long, they may profitably be taken up and read at odd moments. That woman is a power for good or evil they abundantly prove, but whether they show that intellect knows no sex depends on how this dictum is intended to be understood. If it means simply that mind in woman is the same thing as mind in man, then there can be no doubt as to its correctness being established; but if it means that woman is by nature just as well constituted for the engaging successfully in all manner of intellectual pursuits as man is, then our verdict in view of the evidence furnished would be "not proven." The facts presented in these volumes, however, show very clearly that woman is capable of high intellectual achievements and should incite any woman's heart to cultivate her mind as much as possible and to use her God-intrusted power for good. The work is one which is especially well suited for the family or the Sunday-school library. If in the latter more works of the character of these volumes found a place, it would be greatly to the benefit of the rising generation, which, it seems to us, is in real danger of being injured by the trash which the Sunday-school library too frequently furnishes.

YOUNG FOLKS' NATURE STUDIES. By Virginia C. Phoebe. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1887. Price, \$1.00.

LOST ON AN ISLAND. By Mrs. Virginia C. Phoebe. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1887. Price, 80 cts.

The object of these two volumes is to impart instruction and at the same time to awaken in young persons an interest in Nature Studies.

The first-named volume treats of the Six-footed Little People, of the History of a Lump of Coal, and of the Fossils of the Rocks. The second-named volume gives an Account of Salt, of the Sea-anemone, of Coral-making Polyps, of the Sea-cucumber, and of Radiates, &c.

Both volumes are admirably suited to the purpose for which they are intended. They present facts concerning the subjects to which they relate, in a clear, simple and attractive manner, so that young persons can scarcely fail to be interested in them and instructed by them. Like the two volumes just noticed before them, they are well suited for the family, or the Sunday-school library, and deserving a place in both.

SELF-RELIANCE ENCOURAGED. For Young Ladies: Indicating the Principles and Possible Measures which will insure Honorable Success here and hereafter. By James Porter, D.D., author of "The Chart of Life," "The Winning Worker," "Hints to Self-Educated Ministers," "Chris-

tianity Demonstrated by Experience," etc., etc. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1887. Price, \$1.00.

This book, as is indicated on the title-page, is intended for young ladies. One of the leading objects of the author in preparing it was to furnish practical hints to those who are thrown upon their own resources and are obliged to plan for themselves. It is not, however, intended for this class only, but for young ladies generally. Its aim is to impress all with their true interests and responsibilities. Among the subjects treated of are the Importance of Correct Views of Life, Social Vices and Virtues, Domestic Education, Personal Economy, Health, Mental Cultivation, Manners, Marriage, and Religion. The instruction given on these various subjects is throughout sound, practical and highly important. It would be well if every young lady could have a copy of the work placed in her possession, and be induced to study it and follow its directions. This could not but result in increased happiness and well-being.

HEALTHY HOMES AND FOODS FOR THE WORKING CLASSES. By Victor C. Vaughn, M.D., Ph.D., Professor in the University of Michigan. Price, 10 cents.

THE SANITARY CONDITIONS AND NECESSITIES OF SCHOOL-HOUSES AND SCHOOL LIFE. By D. F. Lincoln, M.D. Boston, Mass. Price, 5 cents.

DISINFECTION AND INDIVIDUAL PROPHYLAXIS AGAINST INFECTIOUS DISEASES. By George M. Sternberg, M.D., Major and Surgeon U.S. Army. Price, 5 cents.

THE PREVENTABLE CAUSES OF DISEASES, INJURY AND DEATH IN AMERICAN MANUFACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS, AND THE BEST APPLIANCES FOR PREVENTING AND AVOIDING THEM. By George H. Ireland, Springfield, Mass. Price, 5 cents.

These essays are known as the "Lomb Prize Essays," and are published by the American Public Health Association, a voluntary organization whose object it is to correct the evils growing out of the old order of things, and to bring home to the people the sort of knowledge that is needed to save life and avert disease.

The treatment of the subjects considered in these essays is popular and easily understood, yet, nevertheless, sound and thorough. Of their importance it is not necessary to speak. Every one has more or less interest in the subject of which they treat. The essays deserve, therefore, to find a place in every house in the land, and should be carefully read by all.

They are sold at the low rate indicated, and may be obtained at the book-stores, or of Dr. Irving A. Watson, Secretary of the Health Association, Concord, N. H. The entire four essays may be obtained in pamphlet form for twenty-five cents, or in cloth binding at fifty cents.

PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE. By Rev. T. B. Neely, D.D. Tenth Thousand. Revised Edition. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1886. In paper, 10 cts.; in cloth, 25 cts.

Of the various popular manuals on parliamentary practice, this is one of the very best for general use. In a plain, clear and simple manner it gives just such information as every intelligent person should possess. The work is based on the highest authorities and conforms to the latest and most thoroughly established usages. At the close of the book a very convenient and valuable table of motions, with special points relating to them, is given. By means of this table, any points can be very quickly decided. The work, moreover, is of small size, so that it can be readily carried in a vest pocket.